

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

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2006
6:30 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance From 1/19/06</u>	
		(P)	(A)
Mary C. Fertig	A	3	1
Alan Gabriel	P	4	0
James McCulla	P	4	0
Judith Hunt	P	4	0
Maria Freeman	P	4	0
Edward Curtis	P	4	0
Rochelle Golub	P	4	0
Catherine Maus	P	4	0
Steve Glassman	P	4	0

Planning Staff: Greg Brewton, Deputy Planning & Zoning Director
Wayne Jessup, Architect
Jim Koeth, Principal Planner
Margarette Hayes, Community Development Division
Phil Thornburg, Parks and Recreation Director
Kathy Connor, Parks and Recreation
Yvonne Redding, Planner I

Legal Counsel: Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney

Court Reporting Service: Sandra Goldberg/Margaret Muhl

**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 6:30 p.m., and proceeded to introduce the members of the Planning and Zoning Board, and all rose for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Greg Brewton, Deputy Planning and Zoning Director, proceeded to introduce staff that was present this evening.

1. **G. A. Markus/Croissant Park Cluster Homes**

61-R-05

**Request: ** Site Plan Level III/Four (4) Cluster Dwellings
(RD-15 Zoning)**

Legal Description: 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, less the north 50' thereof

Address: 610 S.W. 15 Street

General Location: South side of S. W. 15 Street, West of S.W.
6 Avenue

2. **Azurite Corporation, Ltd./Yacht Haven**

23-R-05

**Request: ** Site Plan level III/Conditional Use For
Mixed-Use Development/B-2
329 Multi-Family Units with Flex Allocation**

Legal Description: Tract A, Yacht Haven Plat, according to the
plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 157, P. 17
Of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 2323 West State Road 84

General Location: North of State Road 84, West of Interstate 95

3. **Prestige Builders II, Inc./The Harbours**

110-R-05

**Request: ** Site Plan Level III/Waterway Use
RMM-25/24 Multi-Family Units**

Legal Description: Lots 5, 6 and 7 of Nurmi Isles Island No. 4
according to the plat thereof as recorded in
P.B. 24, P. 43 of the Public Records of
Broward County, Florida

Address: 21 through 49 Isle of Venice Drive

General Location: West side of Isle of Venice Drive,
approximately 350 feet North of
East Las Olas Boulevard

4. John Jolly/Jolly Fields

21-P-05

Request: ** Plat Review/RS-8

Legal Description: The West 225' of the East 255' of Lot 46 of the Subdivision of Section 9, Township 50 South, Range 42 East, according to the plat of Said Subdivision made by W.C. Valentine, Surveyor, recorded in P.B. "B", P. 29 of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida.

Address: 1131 S.W. 9 Avenue

General Location: West side of S.W. 9 Avenue approximately one block north of Davie Boulevard

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that staff was recommending that Items 1-4 be tabled until the applications were resubmitted and complete.

Motion made by Ed Curtis and seconded by Maria Freeman to table Items 1-4. Board unanimously approved.

7. Lakeridge Development, LLC/Aqua Vista Yvonne Redding 32-P-05

Request: Alley Vacation/RML-25

Legal Description: A portion of Everglades Sales Company's First Addition to Lauderdale, Florida, According to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 2, P. 15 of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida

General Location: Alley east of South Miami Road between S.E. 12 Street and S.E. 12 Court

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that the applicant for this item was requesting that this matter be continued until May 17, 2006.

Motion made by Steve Glassman and seconded by Rochelle Golub to continue this matter until May 17, 2006. Board unanimously approved.

Judith Hunt entered the meeting at this time.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to explain the procedure that would be followed for tonight's meeting. He then asked Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney to explain the term quasi-judicial, and the role this Board played as Local Planning Agency.

Sharon Miller continued stating that the State of Florida Legislature stated that every City was to have a body that would review certain applications to make sure they complied with the City's Land Use Plan, the Comprehensive Plan which was the overall plan for

the City. This Board was appointed to also act as the Local Planning Agency on behalf of the City. Certain matters, such as rezoning, were reviewed and then a decision made that the development request was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

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.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Rochelle Golub and seconded by James McCulla to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2006 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

5. City of Fort Lauderdale/Parks and Recreation Kathy Connor 12-T-05

Request: * Amend ULDR Section 47-25

*Development Requirements, Section 47-25.2
Adequacy Requirements, Section F, Parks and
Open Space* to update the criteria used by the
City to evaluate the demand created by a
proposed development permit on parks and open
space and to increase the fee to be paid to mitigate
the impact of development.

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that the Board would be serving as the LPA in regard to this matter.

Kathy Connor, Parks and Recreation, stated that this was a request to amend ULDR Section 47-25 – Development Requirements and Adequacy Requirements. She stated that this criteria had not been updated since 1980. She further stated that this section required that an impact fee be paid at the time a building permit was acquired for new development.

Rochelle Golub asked why office buildings were not assessed for the impact fees.

Jim Duncan, Consultant, explained there were two types of impact fees and rarely were such fees placed on schools or parks because it was difficult to establish a nexus between such facilities and non-residential. Other fees are placed against all types of facilities. He added that previously such fees had not been placed on hotels or motels, but they have now been included. He further stated that there was only one park impact fee in the US which was assessed on residential and non-residential units and that was located in Atlanta, Georgia. He explained that most of their City parks were used by suburbanites, and therefore, offices and shopping centers had to be assessed in order to capture such impact.

Rochelle Golub asked about the procedure regarding refunds. She asked if the program was discontinued, why would the City not be permitted to retain impact fees which had

been paid through to the end of the statutory period of six years, rather than refund fees within a year of the termination of the program. Mr. Duncan explained that he would have to defer answering that question to the City Attorney, but he believed that was not how the language was to read.

Sharon Miller explained that the one-year reference was in regard to if there was a claim for a refund, there was a year within the Statute of Limitations to make that claim. She further explained if a project was not built and a demand and need not created by that project, then the City could not retain the funds. She further advised that if no claim was made within the year, then the fees could be retained and spent in accordance with the intended use.

Rochelle Golub further asked how the dollar amount assessed had been determined per unit. Mr. Duncan explained that a study had been prepared providing the formula, and he provided an example. He stated it was a consumption based impact fee system.

Steve Glassman asked how determinations were made in regard to land acquisition. He felt the amount appeared low when one factored in what the cost would be to acquire land for new parks and open spaces. Mr. Duncan stated that they referred back to purchases made by the Parks and Recreation Department during the last five years. Then, they used the average cost per acre, not including beachfront that was listed on the tax assessor's records. He added that such fees could be used to enhance the beach access areas. He explained that purchasing properties to be demolished to enhance beach access was very expensive. Steve Glassman further stated that he hoped such opportunities would be reviewed by the City. He stated that he was concerned about land use types where they had listed units per square feet in connection with hotels/motels. He continued stating that there was now the phenomena of condo/hotel that did not have a specific definition, nor rules that appeared to apply to such a determination. He believed this category could be used to avoid paying such impact fees. Mr. Duncan stated that there were always new things to incorporate into the process, and in the future there would have to be an analysis made of such units.

Judith Hunt stated that she was concerned about affordable housing that appeared to be less affordable. She stated further there did not appear to be any type of exemption or consideration for such individuals, and she felt it would be important to add this type of housing. Furthermore, she stated that office workers did use the parks, and she believed one way to balance things out would be to assess the businesses. She felt this proposal was unacceptable unless businesses were to be included.

James McCulla clarified that some portion of the impact fees actually repaid the existing residents for what had already been purchased. Mr. Duncan explained that the monies collected had to be spent for capacity enhancement purposes. James McCulla stated that this was based on what existing residents theoretically paid for. Mr. Duncan stated that it was based on that in order to arrive at what a fair share of fee would be. He explained that the impact fee law basically stated that newcomers could not be charged for a higher level of service than what they would be receiving, and they are receiving what had been established over the last 100 years. James McCulla asked they had assessed the capacity of the existing parks system. Mr. Duncan confirmed and stated that an inventory had been done of existing facilities and a copy of that report could be provided to the Board. James McCulla stated that he was dealing with capacity and not cost. Mr. Duncan explained that the capacity was calculated by dividing current residents

into the value of what had been built. James McCulla asked if the theory was that every inch of park space was to be used to 100% of its capacity. Mr. Duncan stated that the theory was that the current level of service was what they got both from a residential side and from a facility side. He stated that most communities are attempting to increase their level of service.

James McCulla asked if the comparable impact fees were to go from \$250,000 to \$1.9 million in regard to the same development. Mr. Duncan stated that was probably correct because the existing fee was minimal and had been adopted 18 years ago.

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that in the past fees had been assessed during the platting process, and now assessment would be made when the units were built.

Kathy Connor stated other things had to be counted in on the calculations because there could be existing residential units on the subject site which had a credit, and therefore, the fee would be reduced. She further stated that now monies were collected at platting and they had probably collected approximately \$250,000 during the past five years.

Chair Alan Gabriel asked if this would be applied no matter how the dwelling unit was ascertained. Kathy Connor confirmed. Chair Alan Gabriel asked what type of credit would be granted if the old fee had been paid.

Sharon Miller stated if an old fee had been paid, they would receive a credit at the time of permitting, and differences would be paid at that time also.

James McCulla asked if a fully platted property had paid their impact fees, and this new change was enacted, would they have to pay the additional impact fees which were due. Sharon Miller confirmed.

Mr. Duncan further stated that few contributions had been made under the City's current system. Secondly, most of the major projects being built are being encouraged to contribute some type of monetary funds for the building of parks. Regarding affordable housing, he stated there was a Bill going through the Florida Legislature that encouraged local governments to be more sensitive to affordable housing. He stated that the option chosen by this City was a sliding scale fee meaning that smaller units paid smaller fees. He reiterated that this did not preclude the City from making affordable housing more palatable to developers.

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that there was no waiver option included in the ordinance. Mr. Duncan confirmed, but stated that it could be discussed and added.

Kathy Connor further stated that they still need to determine what shape or form that would take, and it did not preclude this ordinance from being amended to include this. One had to be careful in allowing a credit for affordable housing because such individuals were the ones that needed the parks the most. Instead of giving exemptions, they could apply for programs that ran parallel that paid the fees for them.

Sharon Miller stated that was a workforce housing and not affordable housing. She stated there would be a trust fund for workforce housing, and the Commission would have to decide if it would be appropriate to utilize those funds to pay impact fees. She stated that parks were needed for everyone.

Judith Hunt stated that she believed it was unacceptable for her to vote for this unless a mechanism was supplied regarding an exemption for affordable housing. She stated that if all the answers were not yet available, then they would be voting prematurely. She felt the Commission needed to consider assessing the businesses that were located Downtown. She felt the biggest burden was being placed on individuals who could least afford to pay such fees.

Steve Glassman stated that in the report provided, they had actually averaged less than \$100,000 since 2003, and he asked what projections were being made in regard to the new ordinance. Mr. Duncan stated that the report showed a projection of \$5 Million per year.

James McCulla asked how the bond issue, which financed many of the recent park improvements, factor into the fee calculation. Mr. Duncan explained that any fee impact study had to take into consideration any type of fiscal credits, such as bonds or grants. He reiterated that individuals could not pay twice for the same thing. James McCulla clarified that they essentially reduced the aggregate cost by whatever was paid for with debt that was to be paid off in the future. Mr. Duncan confirmed and stated that included anything that has been out there. James McCulla asked for further clarification of "anything that has been out there." Mr. Duncan further stated that if there was a bond issue that was not paid off that had been taken into consideration. He explained that all this was part of the legal fundamental requirements in preparing an impact fee study. James McCulla asked if this Board should not have access to the study instead of just receiving the conclusions.

Chair Alan Gabriel stated that if the Board wanted to receive copies of the study and defer the matter that could be done.

Rochelle Golub agreed and believed that the Board should have received copies of the study to review, but she did not want to cause a delay for the Parks and Recreation Department. She stated that perhaps this Board could make their comments on this matter, and then let the Commission take such information into account.

Judith Hunt reiterated that she would not be comfortable doing that because comments and recommendations would be made without having access to all the necessary information. She felt that was not being very responsible.

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.

Phil Thornburg, Parks and Recreation Director, stated that the estimated income per year was \$1.3 Million from the fees. He proceeded to apologize to the Board for not distributing copies of the study to them for their review.

Rochelle Golub stated that she was concerned about the comment made by the Consultant that the basic costs had been based on properties purchased by the City. Part of the problem is that the City could not afford to purchase many parcels, and therefore, the study was based on land purchased, but not on land they wanted or could have purchased. She asked for further clarification regarding that issue.

Mr. Thornburg stated that the purchases used had been ones recently purchased with the County bond monies in the last 4-5 years. He stated there were parcels they wanted to purchase, but could not afford to do so. They had to use appraisals for other properties and get the most possible. If they used appraisals instead of assessed values, the numbers would have been higher, but since this had not been done since 1980 they did not want to "sticker shock" everyone. He felt this was a more conservative approach to use to step into things, and later on appraised values could be used.

Chair Alan Gabriel asked why businesses were not assessed.

Mr. Thornburg stated that they could be included, but it would require a lot more time and effort in obtaining such information. All background information would be needed in case someone sued the City so they could support their findings. They felt to get the ball rolling, they needed to have something in place for the new units coming on board.

Chair Alan Gabriel further clarified that something needed to be modified now, and in the future they could work towards including other uses. Mr. Thornburg stated they wanted something in place now, but they also would continue to review other uses, along with deciding whether they wanted to do appraisals or something different.

Rochelle Golub stated that the Building Department would be collecting these fees at the time of permitting, but at the same time it was stated that the "fuzzy" issues would be dealt with based on impact. She stated that unless better identification was done regarding fees and classes of properties, they would be inviting everything to fall under the "fuzzy" category and opening the door for litigation.

Sharon Miller explained that there was zoning in progress in regard to condo/hotels. The Code already provided, and would continue to provide, for lengths of stays and all uses would be considered as a hotel. Restricted covenants would be included as part of the public record. She reiterated that hotels, motels, condos/hotels, and time shares as known for transient use were being treated as hotels. The Land Use Plan stated that hotel units were considered a half-a-unit. She stated that violations are occurring and reports are being made to the State.

Mr. Thornberg further stated that the St. Regis was being considered as a luxury house, and they used the impact of the people in the house and not the cost of the house.

Steve Glassman stated that according to what Sharon Miller stated they would be shorting themselves of 50% of every single hotel/condo unit since they are being treated as half-a-unit. Sharon Miller stated that all requirements for a hotel would have to be met. Steve Glassman stated further that he wanted to support this because he wanted the additional income for the City, but asked if the language could be revised so there would not be a hotel/motel classification.

Mr. Duncan stated if that was done they would be walking on thin ice because a legitimate hotel/motel did not place the same impact on park facilities. He continued stating that when they first began assessing impact fees in 1978 or 1979, one of the first issues that arose was in connection with doing the assessment on a bedroom basis. Now square footage was used because it was easier for building officials to monitor. He stated that it all had to be based on impact, and it was easy to find that a nightly rental

hotel/motel had less impact. These have been added to the process. He further stated that he was sensitive to the affordable housing issue, but he felt instead of shooting down the whole thing that they recommend that the Commission come up with a positive program to waive or mitigate the impact on affordable housing.

James McCulla stated that the hotel/motel issue was getting whacked at the equivalence of a 2500 sq. ft. 4-bedroom house.

Motion made by Steve Glassman and seconded by Rochelle Golub to approve the amended ordinance as proposed. Roll call showed: YEAS: Rochelle Golub, Steve Glassman, Catherine Maus, Ed Curtis, and Alan Gabriel. NAYS: Judith Hunt, James McCulla and Maria Freeman. Motion carried 5-3.

6. City of Fort Lauderdale/CRA Yvonne Redding 15-Z-05

Request: ** * Rezone from I to RCS-15

Legal Description: Lauderdale Industrial Areas, P.B. 31, P. 17,
Lots 14, 15 16 and 17, less access rights
Along west line of lots as defined in Par
683 in CA 72-8386 and less 40 of E 190 of
Lot 17 as described in said Par 683 & North
½ vacated ROW abutting said lots.

Address: 800 N.W. 20 Avenue

General Location: North of N.W. 8 Street, South of N.W. 9
Street, East of I-95 Corridor, West of
N.W. 19 Terrace

Chair Alan Gabriel announced that this matter was quasi-judicial. No disclosures were made by the Board.

Margarette Hayes, Housing and Community Development Manager, stated that the request was for a rezoning from Industrial to RCS-15. She continued stating that she wanted to provide a brief overview of the history of this parcel. Two City Managers ago, the Community Development Office was charged with the responsibility of acquiring vacant parcels that were available, especially in the northwest quadrant of the City, and this was due to there being a large number of abandoned properties, code enforcement issues, and undesirable businesses locating in that area. They were to acquire and accumulate all such parcels so the City could have more control in the community. Several properties were acquired through Land Available for Taxes that was Broward County giving first right of refusal to the City for parcels within the City limits, and some had been deeds in lieu of foreclosures, and there had also been outright donations of properties. Also some parcels had been acquired with CDBG funds. She further stated that a program had to be developed so the properties could be disposed of, and therefore, the City's infill housing program had been created. She stated their charge for that program was to provide home ownership opportunities for very low and low-income individuals.

Ms. Hayes further stated that in regard to other infill efforts, they had taken the skid-row area along the corridor and redeveloped it relocating individuals, and new residences had been constructed. She explained that the CRA was not requesting the rezoning, but it was the Office of Housing and Community Development. She stated that Bob Young had constructed the houses.

Ms. Hayes stated that after the program was initiated, they had the opportunity about 3 years ago to acquire a large tract of land which she proceeded to show on the map. She explained that the tract of land would yield from 8-12 single-family housing units, and in conjunction with surrounding parcels already owned by the City, they were estimating 20-25 single-family homes would be built in the area. She stated that the nearby homeowners association wanted residential development and not commercial in their area.

Yvonne Redding, Planning and Zoning, stated that the zoning being proposed was consistent with the land use and the surrounding areas. She stated there would be no spot zoning. She explained that the "X" on the map indicated a single-family residence that was a non-conforming structure, and the other parcel had billboards on it.

Judith Hunt asked if the single-family residence wanted to remain industrially zoned. Ms. Hayes explained that they had attempted to acquire the property, but no terms had been met. Therefore, the site was not included as part of the process for this request. Judith Hunt asked if the single-family residence was offered a choice for their zoning. Ms. Hayes stated that when an offer was made, the City explained they were going to attempt to rezone the property, but negotiations broke down and they were not included as part of this process. Judith Hunt stated if the City was not going to purchase the land were the residents offered the opportunity to rezone. Ms. Hayes confirmed, but at that time they had declined the offer.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to open the public hearing.

Cassie Evans Isaac, 834 NW 19 Terrace, stated their area was not undesirable, but they wanted to know what was going to be built across from their property. She stated that sufficient information had not been provided to the neighborhood so they could understand what was being proposed.

Ms. Hayes explained that this project was to rezone the property and allow single-family homes to be built instead of it being an industrial area. Ms. Redding stated that the proposed RS zoning restricted lot sizes of 5,000 sq. ft. single-family homes, no duplexes.

Ms. Isaac asked about the time frame for the project. Ms. Hayes stated that if this Board approved the request, the item still had to go before the Commission for approval, and then an RFP would be put out to obtain a builder to construct the homes. Ms. Isaac stated that she was not sure if she was in favor of this or not.

Caritha Bruce, 721 NW 20th Avenue, stated that she was concerned because she was not sure what was being proposed. Her property was zoned Industrial, but she was not in favor of rezoning.

Yvonne Redding explained that Ms. Bruce's property was not included in the area under consideration for rezoning.

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

Greg Brewton, Planning and Zoning, stated that if any residents were concerned about this rezoning, they could come to the Planning and Zoning office and more detail could be provided.

Ms. Hayes requested that this application be approved so they would be able to proceed with the RFP because some contractors were working in the area, and they did not want to have construction costs increase any further.

James McCulla asked if there was a proposed site plan for the parcel. Ms. Hayes explained there was a preliminary site plan, but she did not have it with her this evening. James McCulla suggested that the site plan be shown at the Commission hearing so questions could be answered and more explanation provided. Ms. Hayes reiterated that they wanted this project to be a state-of-the-art one, and people could have the pride of ownership. She stated they are charged to create neighborhoods.

Motion made by James McCulla and seconded by Judith Hunt to approve the request as submitted. Roll call showed: YEAS: Rochelle Golub, James McCulla, Steve Glassman, Judith Hunt, Maria Freeman, Ed Curtis, Catherine Maus, and Alan Gabriel. NAYS: None. Motion to approve carried 8-0.

8. Reliance Andrews, LLC/Flagler Point Wayne Jessup 34-P-05

Request: Alley Vacation/RAC-UV

Legal Description: Lots 17 through 24, Block 319, Progresso, according to the plat thereof, recorded in P.B. 2, P. 18, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida, together with Lots 25 through 32, of the supplemental plat of Block 319, Progresso, according to the plat thereof, recorded in P.B. 2, P. 18 of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida.

General Location: The south portion of the block bounded by North Andrews Avenue on the west, N.E. 6 Street on The south, and NE 1 Avenue on the east

Robert Lochrie, attorney on behalf of the applicant, stated that Reliance Housing Foundation (applicant) was a local foundation and an affordable housing developer. He explained they were requesting a segment of the alley to be vacated which was part of an alley previously vacated by the City in 1997.

Mr. Lochrie continued stating that the site was located at 6th Street and Andrews Avenue. He stated that this would facilitate the development that had been in the works for over two years when a resolution was adopted by the Commission designating the

site for an affordable housing project. He explained that the County had lent the Alliance money to assemble the properties, along with a \$387,000 grant. He stated that the site would be developed using Florida Housing Finance Corporation tax funds and housing credits that had been awarded to this project with an equity interest of over \$20 Million. The total project consists of 176 affordable units, along with nine market-rate townhomes.

Mr. Lochrie further stated that the applicant agreed with staff's recommendations, and the nearby homeowners association endorsed the vacation. He reiterated that the alley was no longer needed.

Chair Alan Gabriel proceeded to open the public hearing.

Wayne Jessup, Planning and Zoning, stated that if the Board approved this request, the following conditions were being recommended by staff:

1. Utility easements were to be relocated, and the full cost of such relocation would be borne by the applicant.
2. Final DRC approval.

James McCulla asked where the utility easements would be relocated. Mr. Lochrie stated that the area designated was along the north property line. He explained that staff had requested 7.5', but the applicant had currently identified 25' that could be utilized in the area. James McCulla asked if staff agreed. Mr. Jessup explained that engineering would have to approve along with the DRC, but he believed it was acceptable.

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

Motion made by James McCulla and seconded by Rochelle Golub to approve the request as submitted per staff's recommendations. Roll call showed: YEAS: James McCulla, Steve Glassman, Catherine Maus, Rochelle Golub, Maria Freeman, Ed Curtis, Judith Hunt, and Alan Gabriel. NAYS: None. Motion to approve carried 8-0.

"For the Good of the City"

No comments were made.

Motion made by Ed Curtis and seconded by Judith Hunt to adjourn the meeting.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:47 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

Alan Gabriel

ATTEST:

Sandra Goldberg For Margaret A. Muhl