

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2012 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

| Board Members | Attendance | June 2011-May 2012 | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| | | Present | Absent |
| Patrick McTigue, Chair | P | 9 | 0 |
| Leo Hansen, Vice Chair | P | 9 | 0 |
| Stephanie Desir-Jean (6:39) | P | 8 | 1 |
| Michael Ferber | P | 2 | 0 |
| James McCulla | P | 8 | 1 |
| Michelle Tuggle | P | 7 | 2 |
| Tom Welch | P | 8 | 1 |
| Peter Witschen | P | 6 | 2 |

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

Ella Parker, Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Thomas Lodge, Urban Design and Development
Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Development
Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Examiner
Cate McCaffrey, Business Enterprises
Frank Snedaker, Chief City Architect
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

The Board recommended by consensus to streamline the review process for certain small impact uses. Some examples that came up included areas such as the beach, where the code specifically defines certain uses and leaves the discretion to approve others as "tourist serving" by the Planning and Zoning Board, and also recommended to authorize staff to use their discretion regarding some of the smaller public purpose requests, either at the Development Review Committee or administrative level, preventing the necessity of bringing these applications before the Board for approval and making the process easier and less expensive for applicants.

Index

Case Number **Applicant**

1. 82R11** Just Ink / THOR % Transwestern Beach Place
2. 24R12** * City of Fort Lauderdale / Sunset Memorial Gardens
3. 46R11** * Halras, LLC / Sachse Medical Office
4. 3P11** * Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale / Northwest Gardens IV Plat
5. 21R12** * City of Fort Lauderdale / Cooley's Landing Maintenance Building
6. Communication to the City Commission
7. For the Good of the City

Special Notes:

Local Planning Agency (LPA) items (*) – In these cases, the Planning and Zoning Board will act as the Local Planning Agency (LPA). Recommendation of approval will include a finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the criteria for rezoning (in the case of rezoning requests).

Quasi-Judicial items ()** – Board members disclose any communication or site visit they have had pursuant to Section 47-1.13 of the ULDR. All persons speaking on quasi-judicial matters will be sworn in and will be subject to cross-examination.

Chair McTigue called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members present and Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members. Attorney Spence explained the quasi-judicial process used by the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Welch, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

1. **Just Ink / THOR % Transwestern Yvonne Redding 82R11**
Beach Place

Request: ** Change of Use: Retail Use to Retail Use with Tattoo Artist

Legal Description: Lauder Del Mar 7-30 B Lots 3,4 and 5 of Block 12

General Location: 17 S. Fort Lauderdale Beach Blvd

Commission District: 2

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on the Item were sworn in.

Roy Smith, representing the Applicant, explained that Just Ink is requesting a re-use of space at Beach Place. This space is approximately 1,240 square foot on the second floor, and currently exists as retail space. Just Ink would like to re-use this space in order to provide tattoos, which represents roughly 25%-30% of their business. They also sell artwork and clothing.

Ms. Desir-Jean arrived at 6:39 p.m.

Mr. Smith continued that Just Ink has the medical licenses required of them in order to provide tattoos. They have two additional locations in Broward County.

Yvonne Redding, representing the Department of Sustainable Development, stated that the space at Beach Place was created as a retail, restaurant, or entertainment establishment. The Application is before the Board because uses catering to tourists in the PRD zoning district must be approved at Site Plan Level IV, which requires both Board and City Commission approval. No additional parking would be required, and the use would be secondary to the retail use.

Vice Chair Hansen asked what signage would be allowed. Ms. Redding said while this had not been discussed, the Applicant's sign package would be consistent with what is allowed for Beach Place.

Mr. McCulla requested clarification that other zoning districts would allow the proposed use without requiring that it come before the Board for approval. Ms. Redding confirmed this, noting that tattoo artistry is considered a service use, which is permitted in other districts. There is currently no other licensed tattoo provider within the PRD district, although this use is not prohibited.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.

Fred Carlson, member of the public, said the Central Beach Alliance (CBA) had held a discussion and "an unofficial vote" on allowing this use, which he estimated had been 2-1 against the Application. He noted that Mr. Smith had not been able to schedule a presentation to the CBA prior to this vote. He said the members had felt the Application would "downgrade" the beach's image, as they did not believe the use was compatible with an upscale destination.

Ms. Tuggle observed that the proposed space is on the second floor of Beach Place, which meant there was no streetfront and customers would need to know where the business is located. Mr. Smith noted that the storefront cannot be seen from A1A or from the first floor of the building, and that business would be generated by the regular traffic coming to Beach Place. He concluded that the Applicant had tried to schedule a meeting with the CBA for two months, but had been unable to do so.

Mr. Ferber commented that when the Beach Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) was created, a finding of necessity was held that may have placed a moratorium on specific uses, such as t-shirt shops. Attorney Spence explained

that there is a list of permitted uses in the PRD; this specific use would fall under "other uses" as cited above if the Board felt it catered to tourists. Their recommendation would go to the City Commission for an ultimate decision.

Mr. McCulla asked if the Board is charged with determining whether or not the use is compatible with tourists, or with tourists and visitors. Attorney Spence pointed out that Code refers to tourists only. Ms. Redding said when the Application came before the Development Review Committee (DRC), they had considered the Application to fall under "commercial retail uses offering services and goods to...tourists and visitors." Attorney Spence observed that if this was the case, the Application would not be before the Board. Ms. Parker stated that the business is considered to be among "other uses."

Mr. McCulla pointed out that it has been very expensive for the Applicant to bring the Application through the required review processes and ultimately before the Board. He did not believe this was fair to the Applicant, and commented that this Application should have been left to the discretion of Staff.

As there were no other members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve as published.

Mr. McCulla asked if the Board could recommend to the City Commission that they reconsider the Application process, as he felt it was unnecessarily burdensome to a small business. Chair McTigue said this would be discussed later as a communication to the City Commission.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

2. City of Fort Lauderdale / Sunset Memorial Gardens Yvonne Redding 24R12

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Request: ** * | Public Purpose Use: Request for relief from Landscape and Setback requirements and Corner Chord requirements for replacement fence |
| Legal Description: | All of sections one, two, three, six and seven of "SUNSET MEMORIAL GARDENS" according to the plat thereof as recorded in plat book 55, page 4 of the public records of Broward County, Florida. Said lands situate and lying in the City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida |
| General Location: | 3201 NW 19 th Street |
| Commission District: | 3 |

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Frank Snedaker, Chief City Architect, explained that he was representing the City's Cemetery Trustees. Sunset Memorial Gardens Cemetery, which is approximately 26.5 acres, went through the City's Procurement Division to obtain bids for a new fence to replace the existing chain-link fence, which surrounds the property on three sides. The contractor, however, was denied a permit because they did not meet the required 3 ft. setback for a fence along a right-of-way.

Mr. Snedaker stated that the property's existing gravesites, irrigation lines, and utilities prevent relocation of the fence. The request is that the new picket fence be permitted to replace the chain-link fence in the same location, which is along the property line. He added that to the south of the property, a wall is located directly on the property line as well.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if the construction of a new fence would affect the current gravesites. Mr. Snedaker said if the new fence is placed exactly in the footprint of the existing fence, there would be no impact; if it must be relocated to a 3 ft. setback with landscaping, however, irrigation lines would have to be replaced, and this excavation would be very close to gravesites. He added that the fence is necessary due to security concerns, as thefts have occurred at some cemeteries.

Vice Chair Hansen suggested that a tree or a low hedge could be sufficient to address the landscaping requirement. He pointed out that if the site were a commercial property, the Applicant would not be allowed to replace the fence without adding landscaping. It was noted that the existing irrigation line is located in the vicinity of the fence, and landscaping would interfere with this line.

Mr. McCulla asked if the existing chain-link fence to be replaced by another chain-link fence. Mr. Snedaker said the same setback would still be required in any case. He did not know if it would be possible to leave the existing poles in place and replace the chain-link only.

Ms. Redding stated that the Applicant is seeking two public purpose reliefs: one would allow the fence to be replaced in its exact location, and another would reduce the required 30 ft. corner to 20 ft., which is the minimum allowed by Broward County Trafficways.

Mr. McCulla asked if the reduction to a 20 ft. corner would reduce visibility from cars exiting onto the main street. Mr. Snedaker said the new fence would be installed slightly inside the existing fence's footprint. The dimensions of the old and new fences would be the same. It was noted that drivers would still be able to see through the fence at this corner.

Mr. Witschen remarked that, as with the previous Application, it was expensive to bring this project before the Board.

There being no questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

3. Halras, LLC / Sachse Medical Office Thomas Lodge

46R11

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Request: ** * | Change of Use with Parking Reduction |
| Legal Description: | The west ½ of lot 3 of the OAKLAND OCEAN MILE, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 28, Page 45 of Broward County, Florida. |
| General Location: | South side of E. Oakland Park Blvd., between Bay View Drive and the Intercoastal Waterway. |
| Commission District: | 1 |

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Rainier Sachse, Applicant, stated that he is a practicing physician who would like to convert an existing building from a general professional office into a medical office for plastic surgery. This would allow him to improve the quality of care for his patients.

Dr. Sachse explained that very few patients would be using his office at any given time. He showed photographs of the building and its parking area. Dr. Sachse concluded that he was requesting a parking reduction in addition to the change of use. He added that two upstairs rooms in the building would serve as administrative offices and as space for his anesthetist.

Mr. Witschen asked how the building would be designated if some space was for medical use and other space for administrative use. Ms. Parker said the parking demand would be designated per use.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if surgical procedures would be performed in the office. Dr. Sachse said these would be plastic surgery procedures under local anesthesia. His office space would provide all surgical procedures downstairs.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if the entrance is located in the back. Dr. Sachse said there are three ground floor entrances: one from the back, one from the front, and an upstairs entrance that could be used in the event of an emergency. Two handicap-accessible parking spaces are located in the front. Patients and staff would park either in the front or back and use the walkway to access the front entrance. Regular hours of operation would be 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

Mr. McCulla asked how many parking spaces are in the lot behind the building. Dr. Sachse said there were 15 spaces; however, with the addition of planned green space, only six spaces with 90-degree parking would be provided. He observed that the building has existed with the old parking configuration for 40 years.

Mr. McCulla noted that another 45 parking spaces are located within 150 ft. of the building. Dr. Sachse confirmed this, pointing out that half of these spaces are metered. Mr. McCulla commented that during weekday business hours, 23 spaces were found to be available at noon.

Ms. Tuggle asked how many staff members would work at the office. Dr. Sachse said there are "two and a half" members in addition to himself. Ms. Tuggle asked if the Applicant proposed to change the landscaping. Dr. Sachse said there is currently perimeter landscaping, and he planned to add more landscaping toward the south side of the building.

Vice Chair Hansen asked if Dr. Sachse could show a survey or site plan that would illustrate his plans for the building and its surrounding area. Dr. Sachse provided Vice Chair Hansen with copies of these plans, noting the stacking area and extended landscaping.

Attorney Spence requested that the plans be provided as part of the record if they differed from the backup materials provided. Chair McTigue advised that the plan being shown was page A-3 of the backup.

Mr. Witschen recalled there had been discussion at a previous Board meeting of conducting a study that showed different types of medical uses had different parking demands. Ms. Parker said there were no studies of this nature for the area in which the Application is located.

Mr. Ferber said it seemed plausible that the office could function in this area, but noted that the request was for a parking reduction in excess of 70%, with only a single parking study provided. He expressed concern that the study calculated the use of available lots during August rather than during the slower season. He added that he did not know what other uses exist within certain distance of the site, and therefore had less confidence in granting the Application than he would if he knew what other buildings and uses shared the parking, or how much

parking was available to these buildings. He concluded that there is insufficient data in the parking study to determine whether or not the request should be granted.

Dr. Sachse agreed that the practice may be busier in the winter months, and showed a graph reflecting the use of nearby parking spaces in the month of February at different times of the day. He also showed other buildings in the area, pointing out that the spaces for these buildings are heavily underused.

Mr. Witschen requested clarification of whether the parking reduction, if granted, would be tied to the Applicant's business license or to the land itself. Attorney Spence said parking reductions go with the land. He added that the Board may place conditions on the reduction, and that Code provides for the termination of the parking reduction order if the use changes.

Dennis Girisgen of Public Works and Engineering advised that he had looked at the site itself as well as the report. He explained that the reduction was adjusted for season and vacancies in nearby buildings, and asserted that there is still a great deal of parking available. He was comfortable with the reduction request.

Mr. McCulla observed that the Staff report provides the calculations used to arrive at the required number of parking spaces. He pointed out if the use was all retail rather than medical, the requirement would be for roughly 14 parking spaces, which cannot possibly be met by the Applicant.

Mr. Welch recalled that parking reductions have regularly come before the Board for a number of years, and stated that the City does not seem to have a clear record of past parking reductions that have been granted in the surrounding area. Mr. McCulla advised that any parking study incorporates current conditions, such as seasonality, vacancy, and nearby parking reductions, which are listed as a matter of public record. Mr. Welch explained that he was concerned certain areas of the City may be saturated with parking reductions.

Tom Lodge, representing the Department of Sustainable Development, stated that a map is available at the Department showing the location and number of spaces associated with every parking reduction in the City. He said a copy of this map could be made available to the Board for future reference.

Mr. Lodge continued that the Applicant is requesting a change of use from professional office to medical office, with a parking reduction. The 3537 sq. ft., two-storey building will have two uses: 2487 sq. ft. of medical office use and 1050 sq. ft. of administrative/professional office use. A total of 21 parking spaces are required for these proposed uses. The Applicant is requesting that this be reduced to six on-site parking spaces, or a 71% parking reduction. The ULDR

adequacy requirements for the reduction have been met and Staff recommends that the Board approve the Application.

Ms. Tuggle asked how many staff members were associated with the administrative office use. Dr. Sachse said this would be himself and one other individual, and would occur when the medical office is not in use.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Witschen commented that the percentage of the parking reduction was dramatic; however, he felt the Application could be approved if the reduction was limited by condition to the Applicant's specific medical practice and balance of office use. Should the practice change or the business relocate, he felt the reduction should be eliminated. Dr. Sachse said he had no objection to this condition.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve, with the condition that the parking reduction is recommended subject to the fact that the medical practice has to stay in this line of work, plastic surgery, and the balance of the mix could go more office than medical [use] but it could not go more medical than office; [also] should the practice change its specialty, or should it cease to exist, then its parking reduction would be null and void.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if patients would pay for the metered parking in front of the location. Mr. Girisgen clarified that half these spaces are metered and half are free parking. Ms. Desir-Jean asked why these spaces were metered in an underused area. Mr. Girisgen said this was done through a prior arrangement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if changes to parking scenarios took these metered spaces into consideration. Attorney Spence said the parking reduction is based on a decision that there is adequate parking available, or that Code requires too much parking for the use. While this would reduce the amount of parking the owner is required to provide on a property, it would not necessarily reflect a reduction in demand.

Ms. Desir-Jean pointed out that she would not want to pay for a parking space at a doctor's office, although the doctor may want a parking reduction. Mr. Girisgen clarified that Code requirements allow for the use of public parking spaces

without distinguishing whether or not these spaces are metered or non-metered, or may generate revenue for the City.

4. Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale / Northwest Gardens IV Plat Thomas Lodge 3P11

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Request: ** * | Plat Approval |
| Legal Description: | A portion of lot 25, block "A" of CITRUS PARK FARMS according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 1, Page 138 of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida and a portion of the northeast ¼ of section 4, Township 50 south, Range 42 east City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida. |
| General Location: | West side of NW 12 th Avenue, between NW 7 th Street and NW 8 th Street. |
| Commission District: | 3 |

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, showed an aerial photo and plat for the property, stating that the request is for a boundary plat for a parcel of approximately six acres. The plat would allow the Applicant to proceed with rehabilitation of the site in the event that funding becomes available for this purpose. The property, Lindsey Apartments, consists of 99 units. Zoning is RM-25, which would yield a total of 149 units on-site. A restrictive note is being placed on the plat to limit this to 118 units, which is less than what is allowed by Code but is consistent with what the Applicant feels would comfortably fit on the site.

Mr. Lochrie noted that there was an error in the graphics, and clarified that there are three additional buildings located within the plat boundaries. The Applicant has met with the president of the neighborhood association and explained the project in detail.

Mr. Lodge stated that the Applicant proposes to plat a 5.96 acre parcel to allow for the next phase of the Northwest Gardens affordable housing project. The Application is consistent with Objective 5 of the future land use element, which requires consistency with the Broward County regulations for platting.

There being no questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Lochrie clarified that he had spoken with several residents of the Lindsey Apartments to explain if funding became available for the future redevelopment

of the property, the residents would be informed. The Housing Authority will typically provide housing for any residents during the redevelopment stage, and those residents who wish to move back to the location are given the first opportunity to do so when the project is complete.

Mr. Witschen asked if this project would come back to the Board in the future. Mr. Lochrie said it would not come back to the Board, but the Site Plan would have to go through the City's DRC process before it is granted a building permit.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

5. City of Fort Lauderdale / Cooley's Thomas Lodge 21R12
Landing Maintenance Building

Request: ** * Public Purpose Use for relief from Setback and Wall Requirements

Legal Description: A portion of Lots 3,4,5 and Lot 17, less the West 10.00 feet, Block 32, L.H. BRYAN'S SUBDIVISION of Block 32, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

General Location: West side of Southwest 4th Avenue, on the north side of the New River.

Commission District: 4

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Mr. Snedaker explained that this is a very active facility, including boat ramps, an administration building, a restroom/shower/laundry building, and a small picnic pavilion. The Application requests approval of a small maintenance building on the site at which equipment could be stored. In addition to Site Plan approval, there are two public purpose requests for a buffer wall and setback reduction. The reduction is needed on the west side of the property so the maintenance building may be accommodated.

Due to circulation patterns, existing parking and buildings, and lines of sight to the Sailboat Bend area, this would be the best location for the new structure, which would be constructed beneath a bridge in a vegetated area so it cannot be seen from either the water or the street.

Mr. Snedaker showed a visual rendering the layout of the site, including the area in which the maintenance building would be located.

Mr. Witschen asked if the property is abutted by single-family homes. Mr. Snedaker confirmed that these homes are to the south and the west, and that the residents are aware of the Application. The Application was approved 7-0 by the

Historic Preservation Board in January 2012; he noted that families from the nearby residential area spoke in favor of the project at that meeting.

Mr. Witschen asked where storage is currently being accommodated at the site. Mr. Snedaker replied that there is no central location at which materials are kept; in addition to existing materials, a golf cart must also be kept at the facility, which is the main reason the new building is needed.

Mr. Lodge stated the request is for relief from ULDR 47.830, which requires a 25 ft. setback for any structure. The building would be placed in a setback area in order to avoid any conflict with the 4th Avenue Bridge, access to the boat ramp, or site parking or lighting. The City is also requesting relief from 47.253.a.d.4, which would require construction of a required wall due to the existing landscaping on the site. The proposal is consistent with the City's comprehensive plan, and the use is consistent with the future land use element, which allows park and open space uses. Staff recommends approval of the request.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Vice Chair Hansen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

6. Communication to the City Commission

Ms. Parker referred to Mr. Witschen's earlier suggestion that a communication be sent to the City Commission regarding the need to streamline the approval process for small impact uses. She advised that the City is currently seeking to streamline the development review process, as they realize the need for various approvals can be an expensive and lengthy process.

Mr. Witschen explained that his concern for Items 1, 2, and 3 is that all these projects are either located in a historically struggling business area. He stated that authorizing Staff to use their discretion regarding small impact uses, whether at the DRC or administrative level, would prevent the necessity of bringing these uses before the Board for approval.

Ms. Parker pointed out that this would ultimately result in Ordinance changes to allow Staff this freedom. Mr. Witschen agreed that this was his intent.

Mr. McCulla observed that Items 1 through 3 dealt with existing facilities and conditions faced by a small business, a medical practice, and the City. In each case, the Applicants invested several months of time and thousands of dollars in

plans, studies, and fees to address relatively minor issues because the existing conditions cannot meet Code. He agreed with Mr. Witschen that Staff should be able to address these issues.

Mr. McCulla asserted that Staff has in-depth knowledge of City Code, which meant while this specific use may not be listed under permitted uses in a district, Staff could apply common sense and recognize that this service should be permitted. He stated once more that Staff should be empowered to make a decision of this nature. Mr. Witschen added if an Application was denied by Staff, it could then be brought before the Board for further consideration.

Mr. Sachse suggested that an Item could also come before the Board if there was public objection to the Application. Mr. Witschen did not agree, noting that Staff could take public concern into account as well.

Ms. Parker commented that while tattoo providers may not have been included as a use in a particular district when Code was written, perceptions of this and other businesses may have changed over time to become more accepting and it might now be considered an appropriate use.

Vice Chair Hansen cautioned that in some cases, such as Item 3, there may be a long-standing issue with parking, and the Applicant would still have had to invest a similar amount of time going through the DRC approval process, as cars were forced to back out onto the street into a commercial area. He felt the additional step of coming before the Board allowed them to address this and other safety issues in the immediate area.

It was determined that the Board's communication to the City Commission would ask for Staff to have greater discretion to make more decisions that could prevent Applicants from having to go through a prolonged process. Ms. Parker noted that in the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA area, parking reductions may be addressed at Staff level.

Mr. Welch did not agree with this conclusion for parking reductions, stating that there is a reason these issues continue to come before the Board and the public should be able to continue to weigh in on this matter. He stated that parking reductions should continue to be come before the Board in order to provide a public forum for these concerns. He agreed, however, with the communication with respect to Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Witschen suggested there was Board consensus that Items 1 and 2 could be used as illustrations of why the review process should be streamlined.

7. For the Good of the City

Planning and Zoning Board

March 21, 2012

Page 14

None.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

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