



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2023
9:30 A.M.**

Please be advised that in keeping with a recent directive from the Town Council, the minutes of all Town Boards and Commissions will be "abbreviated" in style. Persons interested in listening to the meeting, after the fact, may access the audio of that item via the Town's website at www.townofpalmbeach.com or may obtain an audio recording of the meeting by contacting Kelly Churney, Deputy Town Clerk at (561) 227-6340.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Coniglio called the meeting to order at 9:29 a.m.

Gail Coniglio, Chair	PRESENT
Rick Pollock, Vice Chair	ABSENT (Excused)
Richard Kleid, Member	PRESENT
Michael Spaziani, Member	PRESENT
Eric Christu, Member	PRESENT (left at 12:47 p.m.)
Marilyn Beuttenmuller, Member	PRESENT
Jorge Sanchez, Member	PRESENT (left at 12:55 p.m.)
William Gilbane, Alternate Member	PRESENT
Nicki McDonald, Alternate Member	PRESENT (left at 12:53 p.m.)
John Tatoes, Alternate Member	PRESENT

Staff Members present were:

Wayne Bergman, Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
James Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, Zoning and Building
Jennifer Hofmeister-Drew, Planner III
Kelly Churney, Acting Town Clerk

II. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Churney led the Commission with an Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The following changes were presented to the Commission:

Ms. Hofmeister-Drew asked to reorder section VI., so that Item B. was to be discussed first, then Item C. second, and the discussion would end with Item A.

Mr. Bergman asked to defer Item VII. A to the May 3, 2023, meeting.

Mr. Bergman stated that Item VII. B. would be presented by the applicant.

Mr. Bergman stated that he would also like to discuss additional meeting dates proposed by the Zoning Consultants at the end of the agenda.

Mr. Bergman stated that the agenda presented would be the same agenda for the May 3, 2023, meeting, and the items for discussion not completed by the Commission would be continued at that time.

Motion made by Mr. Kleid and seconded by Mr. Spaziani to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 5, 2022, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Motion made by Mr. Kleid and seconded by Mr. Christu to approve the December 5, 2022, meeting minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

V. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS – 3-MINUTE LIMIT, PLEASE

Stan Johnson, 244 Nightingale Trail, expressed concerns and suggestions for changing the building height definitions. He was currently working with an architect on a design of a home to be built on the north end of the island. He shared his support for some of the staff recommendations but was concerned about the building height definition.

VI. CODE REVIEW ITEMS FOR STUDY & RECOMMENDATION FROM THE TOWN COUNCIL REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 134 – ZONING

Prior to the discussions, Mr. Kleid asked how the changes would affect residents. He asked if the changes would appear in a re-drafted code when it was promulgated to provide an additional opportunity for the Planning and Zoning Commission to review the items.

Director Wayne Bergman responded that there were a lot of interrelated items: fill, freeboard, point of height, building height, and zero datum. Changing the freeboard height from 1 foot to 2 feet would automatically change the building height. Mr. Kleid reiterated his concern about proceeding at this time. He asked what immediate benefits would be experienced by residents if all the recommended changes were approved and what the damage would be if nothing were approved. Mr. Bergman said freeboard was all about resiliency. He indicated that FEMA maps were constantly being revised based on better information. He said the freeboard height could start at 2 feet or 1 ½ feet. However, it could not be anything less than 1 foot. He did not see any unwarranted outcome from the changes. Ms. McDonald wondered why the amount of fill was not being considered at the same time as the building height discussions. Mr. Bergman responded that the fill amount requirement had been changed and was capped approximately two years ago based on FEMA requirements and the crown of the road. He said the FEMA requirement could be modified by a change in freeboard from 1 foot to 2 feet, which would automatically change the fill calculation. He said some changes would be necessary, but there were a lot of details in the code, and the Town Council had expressed a sense of urgency for some easy changes. Mr. Sanchez asked if the drawings by Fairfax and Sammons would be incorporated into the conversation, to which Mr. Bergman replied in the affirmative. Mr. Tatoes asked if the decision was made to recommend 2 feet of freeboard, and if

the definitions for building height require modification.

Mr. Bergman said they were workable with the change. It was easy to adjust the fill and the building height based on the freeboard height. Mr. Bergman responded that one measurement point would be needed for most properties to begin the building height measurements.

Ms. Coniglio asked staff to describe the possible implications during each discussion so the Commission would have a good frame of reference during the decision-making process.

A. Article VI. District Regulations. Division 8-12. Pertaining to Commercial Zoning Districts Related the Following:

1. Business Tax Receipts (BTR) and Permitted Non-Conforming Uses

Mr. Murphy discussed that some of the administrative decisions for Business Tax Receipt (BTR) use require approval to be granted by the Town Council for Special Exception applications. He asked for the code to be changed to indicate that administrative approval would be permissible for “like-for-like uses” since there was no change in the use (example: retail to retail, bank to bank). This change would not apply to restaurants, bars, or nightclubs. Mr. Murphy discussed another change proposed by staff, which was if a special exception approval had been granted in the past, and the newly proposed use was fundamentally the same, as determined by the Planning and Zoning Director, that application could also be approved administratively. However, those Special Exception applications for bars, lounges, restaurants, outdoor seating, and dining halls were not part of the proposed approval process. Those uses would require a new Special Exception application. He also discussed another change proposed under permitted uses.

Mr. Kleid said that historically when a new restaurant had come to town, and an application has been made for a special exception, the Town Council had invariably granted approval provided it was another restaurant going into the location where a restaurant was already in business. Mr. Murphy responded that restaurants were modified to require a special exception approval. Previously, restaurants were a permitted use in several of the zoning districts. Secondly, staff was specifically directed to have restaurants as a different special exception, still subject to approval by the Town Council.

Mr. Murphy provided an additional explanation for the suggested change.

Ms. Coniglio thought the change was wise. However, she expressed concern about the notice to the public. She understood the concept if the same rules applied to a new restaurant. She agreed that if there were no changes in the use or the square footage, it would be a wise clean-up to the code. She questioned whether the administrative approval would go to the Town Council as a consent agenda item.

Mr. Bergman responded that a special exception was not a project that would proceed to the Town Council; it would only be a licensing matter. He explained that the staff was trying to remove taxation and licensing from the zoning code.

Mr. Tatoes suggested clarifying the proposed language by changing it from “reasonably

similar” to “substantially or materially similar.”

Mr. Gilbane wanted to ensure that the change would not dramatically impact traffic or put undue parking restraints in the area with a similar change in use.

Mr. Murphy stated that the staff had identified where a change in the category would require the applicant to apply for a change of use. He said that currently, the commercial districts had a square footage requirement that would trigger the requirement for a special exception use. Mr. Murphy suggested that the Commission consider an “if a business is greater than” clause to prevent unintended consequences.

Ms. Coniglio asked if a suggestion was being made to put a square footage cap on what the BTR transfer could be, administratively, with the addition of language as proposed by the staff.

Mr. Sanchez thought the proposed change was suitable. He thought the staff could make the determination.

Mr. Kleid agreed with Mr. Tatoes and thought the word “reasonable” should be changed.

Mr. Murphy stated that Mr. Randolph had reviewed the change in wording. He added that he would change the word reasonably to substantially. He also indicated that a clause could be added to the wording to indicate that a certain square footage requirement would need a special exception.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocanut Row, shared her thoughts about the discussion.

Motion made by Mr. Kleid and seconded by Mr. Spaziani to approve the proposed changes to the Ordinance, Exhibit A, to reflect an addition of maximum square footage and to change the word “reasonably” to a stronger word. Motion carried 6-1, with Mr. Sanchez dissenting.

Mr. Kleid asked Mr. Sanchez for his opinion on the nay vote. Mr. Sanchez stated that he believed this action would limit the staff’s ability to disapprove of a use that was not town-serving.

2. Air Conditioning and Generator Equipment

Ms. Hofmeister-Drew reviewed the changes in the code pertaining to mechanical equipment.

Mr. Murphy further explained that this language would clarify the rooftop exceptions for mechanical equipment. There were benefits in the language, which include freeing up potential greenspace on the ground floor, mitigating A/C commercial use, and generators that were larger than those of single-family residential structures.

Ms. Coniglio liked the concept but expressed concern for residential homes within commercial districts. She wondered if the staff had control over the final placement.

Mr. Murphy stated that staff would have control over the placement.

Mr. Kleid suggested deferring this item to allow additional time for consideration.

Mr. Spaziani asked that the flagpole height be addressed.

Mr. Bergman stated that the mechanical equipment language needed to be changed but acknowledged and understood that the entire code needed to be reviewed. He indicated that the entire code was under review.

Mr. Tatoes asked why the 8 feet was proposed; he wondered if 6 feet would be more appropriate. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew said that was the maximum height the staff had seen with mechanical equipment. Mr. Bergman said some of the equipment was already 6-7 feet tall, and if the change still required everything to have a variance, then the code issues had not been resolved.

Mr. Gilbane asked staff to discuss what the proposed decibel ratings would be. He was in favor of the suggestion and thought it would be good for the residents.

Ms. Coniglio asked what the accumulation of equipment would be and asked to ensure that combining everything on the roof would not worsen the problems.

The consensus of the Commission was to defer the item to the May 3, 2023, meeting.

Ms. Beuttenmuller wondered whom the staff had consulted with on this item. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew responded.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, thought that the revised language should include a statement that indicated mechanical rooms on rooftops should not be allowed to be converted to an additional story.

Mr. Bergman thought that Ms. Pepper's comments related to the definition of a story rather than mechanical equipment.

A discussion ensued about mechanical equipment on rooftops compared to an additional story.

B. Article IV. Nonconformities. Division 4.-Land. Pertaining To Development and Redevelopment of Nonconforming Lots

Mr. Bergman explained that the current code stated that if a person had a nonconforming lot in a single-family residential zoning district before it could be developed, a special exception and/or site plan would be required depending on criteria and how the lot was platted. A variance would be required before development when considering a commercial or multi-family nonconforming lot. Mr. Bergman indicated that the staff was proposing multi-family and commercial nonconforming lots to remain a required variance, but for single-family districts, if a

nonconforming lot existed, it would no longer require a special exception.

Mr. Sanchez asked if the change would apply to existing lots, to which Mr. Bergman replied in the affirmative. Mr. Sanchez asked how this would be applied on the Sea streets or other streets where the lots had been combined. He said the language was clear that a property owner could not keep the old platting. Mr. Bergman said if there was a 25-foot lot and something was constructed on it, it would be assumed that there was a unity of title. He said the recognized tax parcel that currently existed, in theory, would have a unity of title.

Mr. Kleid asked why the multi-family and commercial districts were carved out. Mr. Bergman responded and explained.

Mr. Murphy stated that the lots in question were usually the fabric of the neighborhood. He reminded the Commission that the projects were still heavily reviewed by the Architectural Review or Landmarks Preservation Commission. He said the subject of this conversation was historically platted lots that had already been developed with a residence. The staff's goal with this item was to streamline the process.

Ms. Coniglio reviewed the proposed changes. She stated she would not support making these changes for multi-family or commercial uses. Mr. Bergman said a variance would be required for expanding a nonconformity for setbacks and building heights including accessory structures.

Mr. Tatoes wondered if this would create an incentive to demolish existing structures. Mr. Bergman did not believe it would provide the incentive. Mr. Murphy elaborated on the subject and said the historically significant building program was thriving, and people understood the benefits.

Motion made by Mr. Christu and seconded by Mr. Sanchez to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the Town Council for approval.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment.

John Eubanks, Attorney with Sniffen & Spellman, stated that residents felt that the approval by the Town Council would be a double review.

Mr. Bergman and Mr. Murphy responded that all regulations in the building code still must be complied with; all those regulations would remain intact.

Mr. Sanchez asked about a home being rebuilt in the event of a fire. He reviewed a scenario where a homeowner could not rebuild their home exactly where the original house was on the lot due to Code requirements.

Mr. Murphy stated that the change would target smaller lots, with demolition and reconstruction. The same geometric markers must exist, and there must have been a house that was demolished by fire or at the owner's desire.

Mr. Tatoes requested that the wording "and the lot retains" be added to clarify that the lot is the subject of the change.

Motion made by Mr. Christu and seconded by Mr. Sanchez to change/add the language "and the lot retains" in paragraph C.

Mr. Sanchez stated he felt the proposed change would not protect the same fiber of the neighborhood area. He said the beauty of some of the streets with landmarked homes, in many ways, was that the properties were not required to conform with the current code. If those same properties were required to adhere to the present code, the fiber of the neighborhood would change.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

C. Article 1. In General. Section 134-2. – Definitions And Rules of Construction, Pertaining to The Following:

1. Minimum Flood Elevation(Freeboard)
2. Building Height Definition
(Associated Changes to Chapters 18 and 50 Related to Minimum Flood Elevation)

Mr. Bergman explained the proposed changes. There were currently nine different definitions for building heights. Staff and the consultant had mapped out each definition and came up with a single definition of building height. The goal was to find the location of the point of measurement of all buildings and to consolidate the nine definitions into a single comprehensive definition. To simplify the point of measurement, also referred to as the zero datum, there were three types of properties in the town: 1) those that were seaward of the coastal control line; 2) properties in most of the town that were in a FEMA zone; and 3) properties in the “X” flood zone. The proposed measurement was based on that criterion.

Ms. Coniglio asked if a fill requirement and a FEMA requirement could coexist. Mr. Bergman said fill brought the entire lot to the FEMA-required elevation.

Ms. Coniglio asked about both requirements, fill and FEMA. Mr. Bergman said they were all interrelated but acting independently. He said the amount of fill that could be placed on a lot was currently limited. However, the property owner still had to elevate a house based on whatever the freeboard requirements were, and the property owner had to comply with FEMA requirements.

Ms. Coniglio indicated that the diagrams were abstract and wondered if Mr. Suder would have better drawings.

The Commission requested a comparison of how the same structure would look at each point of measurement.

Stan Johnson, 244 Nightingale Trail, thought making the decisions before the FEMA outcome in the fall could be premature. He then pointed out a few clarifications on the drawings presented.

Jamie Crowley, attorney with Gunster, thought the point of measurement was determined to be the lowest point between the two neighbors.

Mr. Bergman stated he could reiterate what the Code indicated and stated that staff had been dealing with several of these projects in Town.

Mr. Gilbane thought it was important to understand the one-off issues being brought up by people. He thought it was important to understand how the proposed changes would prevent the one-offs in the future.

Ms. Coniglio asked the Commission to provide directions to the staff so they could be prepared for the meeting on the third of May. She understood that the pictures with freeboard and fill measurements were important.

Mr. Sanchez said the information requested would demonstrate the worse situation and the solutions being proposed.

Mr. Kleid referred to Exhibit B and asked about the purpose of a cupola. Mr. Bergman stated it was an architectural feature. Mr. Kleid thought the language was vague. Mr. Bergman said the language could specify a size limit.

Mr. Sanchez did not feel that the language should be so restrictive.

Mr. Gilbane thought the purpose would be an architectural feature, and ARCOM or LPC would determine whether it served its purpose.

Mr. Christu thought language could be added to indicate “as determined by ARCOM or LPC.”

Ms. McDonald thought the purpose of the changes was to remove the need for a variance. She asked about the guidelines provided to the design team.

Mr. Bergman thought the nine definitions of building heights could be dialed back to a single definition.

Ms. Coniglio asked if there was a universal place to start. Mr. Bergman said it would be impossible to have just one scope for the Town of Palm Beach because of the three distinct property types.

Mr. Bergman reiterated the changes being proposed.

Motion made by Mr. Kleid and seconded by Mr. Gilbane to recommend to the Town Council the approval of Exhibit “B” Code of Ordinances with an additional amendment to read that it agrees to accomplish the purposes it serves, as determined by ARCOM or LPC.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment.

Stan Johnson, 244 Nightingale Trail, asked if the application pulled in the interim could be subject to this change.

Mr. Bergman stated that the change would replace the language on building heights.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. McDonald asked about the CCR and FAR discussions. She wanted to know if ZoneCo. would consider what the FAR calculation would contain. Mr. Bergman stated that the proposed meeting dates with ZoneCo. and their recommendations would be discussed and provided over the summer months.

Mr. Sanchez stated he wished the Commission had more input into the process of Code Review.

Maggie Zeidman, 229 Barton Avenue, acknowledged that the Code was broken. She said the intention was to fix the code so that variances were not required.

Mr. Kleid thought it was important to reduce the number of variances heard by the Town Council.

VII. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:**

A. Recommendation to Amend Resolution No. 3-00, The Breakers Planned Unit Development (PUD-A), Related to Site Modifications at the Tennis Center

1. Discussion
2. Draft Resolution

This PUD was deferred to the May 3, 2023, Commission meeting.

B. Consideration of Draft Ordinance Regarding a Proposed Text Amendment to Division 8, C-TS Town Serving Commercial District, Section 134-1114,

Relating to Arcades Constructed within Public Right-Of-Ways

1. Discussion
2. Draft Ordinance

Jamie Crowley, attorney with Gunster, requested a recommendation to the Town Council for an amendment to the Code to allow applicants to request arcades over sidewalks in the C-TS Zoning District. He reviewed the process for the zoning text amendment. He talked about his presentation of the item to the Town Council. He briefly touched on his proposal and added that the Landmarks Preservation Commission felt the proposed arcade was appropriate. He reviewed the Code section language being proposed, which mirrored the language in the C-WA language. He addressed the concerns stated in the letters from John Eubanks and Jamie Gavigan. He indicated that he sent the proposal to Zoning Consultant Sean Suder. Mr. Crowley read Mr. Suder's response to the Commission.

Mr. Kleid was in favor of arcades. He wondered why the acquisition of the property, maintenance responsibility, and indemnification provisions were not included. Mr. Crowley said he would be open to breaking the information down and adding subsections.

Mr. Sanchez thought the proposal would be a significant advantage to the Town.

Mr. Spaziani agreed with Mr. Kleid but expressed concern about an individual building on public property.

Ms. Coniglio was in favor of internal colonnades and arcades. She expressed concern about adding them externally. Her concern was that the addition of external arcades would affect the general public. She was not interested in selling the Town of Palm Beach's valuable areas, such as easements.

Mr. Gilbane was a fan of the architectural elements, but administratively, he was not sure how the Town would get paid or what insurance requirements would be.

Mr. Tatooles agreed with Ms. Coniglio but expressed concern with usable space above the colonnade. Mr. Tatooles thought that the proposal would only benefit the building owner, not the community.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment.

John Eubanks, attorney representing The Leverett House, and the Palm Beach Biltmore Condominium Association, asked about the timing of the request. He did not believe the request was a priority and thought the item was development driven.

Jamie Gavigan, attorney representing Sun and Surf buildings, agreed with Mr. Eubanks. On behalf of his clients, he was concerned about how the proposal would work and its impact on the community.

Anita Seltzer, 44 Cocoanut Row, expressed concern about the usages that could be added over the colonnades.

Mr. Crowley stated that he was working with the residents at Sun and Surf. He stated that some of his clients chose to pursue this architecture, and some did not. He thought that a developer constructing the structures would want some type of return because of the associated expense.

Mr. Kleid thought that an arcade should be continuous for the entire block.

Mr. Crowley responded that he was only asking the Commission to recommend that the Town Council review this proposal pertaining to colonnades and arcades.

Mr. Sanchez agreed with Mr. Crowley. He thought the new buildings on Royal Poinciana Way were a mistake because of the Town Code.

Mr. Gilbane asked for clarification from staff on what was being asked of the Commission. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew responded that the staff was asking for a recommendation from the Commission to the Town Council to move forward with the proposal.

Mr. Sanchez stated that currently, there were three types of uses above the arcades.

Ms. Hofmeister-Drew stated that ARCOM and LPC would review these arcades.

Mr. Gilbane thought that ARCOM and LPC should consider the neighborhood's beautification when considering these arcades.

Mr. Christu asked if the Commission could recommend the item in concept. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew responded.

Ms. Coniglio agreed to recommend, in concept, but thought there was not enough detail. She thought there should be more parameters added.

Mr. Kleid agreed with Ms. Coniglio, he liked the concept of the arcades. He thought more detail should be placed into the ordinance with further study, more public input, and more drafting of the ordinance.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, commented that these buildings should not have habitable space above the colonnades and arcades.

Mr. Crowley asked for the item to be deferred until August 2, 2023. He stated that the ordinance would be redrafted with specific language, as requested by Mr. Kleid. He hoped there would be a compromise that would work for everyone.

Ms. Coniglio said public input was invaluable. The public could provide their input to the Planning and Zoning Commission and Town Council.

After the discussion, there was a consensus to defer the item to the August 2, 2023, meeting. The applicant agreed with the deferral.

C. Review and Recommendation to Town Council on the Zoning In Progress (Zip)

Resolution No. 040-2023, Relating to Restaurants, Bars, Lounges, Nightclubs and Private Clubs

Mr. Bergman discussed the zoning in progress enacted by the Town Council. He discussed the study to be conducted by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said there was a perception that there may be too many restaurants in town, and they were traffic generators and caused parking problems. A traffic study was in process.

Ms. Coniglio thought more information would be helpful.

Mr. Bergman stated he could build a package together to include everything from Mr. Randolph's memorandum and how to employ limitations. This information would be sent to the Commissioners before their next meeting. The traffic and parking study would not be completed for the next few months.

Mr. Spaziani asked if there was any study based on the number of residents compared to the number of restaurants. Mr. Bergman stated that it would be a saturation study. He said perhaps Sean Suder and his team could join the Commission for that discussion.

Mr. Gilbane thought that there were things occurring in Town that were creating traffic issues. He acknowledged that the Declaration of Use Agreements was a way to control the traffic; however, enforcing such an agreement would be paramount. He thought there might be a problem with enforcement.

Mr. Kleid understood that the Town wanted to hire more code enforcement employees.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment. There were no comments heard at this time.

D. Presentation on the Evaluation and Appraisal Review of the Town's Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Hofmeister-Drew provided an update on the review and evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Coniglio wondered if there was a way to correlate the Comprehensive Plan to the town's Strategic Plan.

Mr. Tatoes asked about sustainability related to the Town. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew said every Comprehensive Plan should have language that refers to environmental protection and safety for residents. She said the town-serving nature is in the Comprehensive Plan document.

Ms. Coniglio noted that the community was suggesting sustainability, which was managed growth. She was unsure how the Comprehensive Plan or the Strategic Plan, or the work of the Commission would create a situation where development would become a long-term managed situation. Ms. Hofmeister-Drew said the Town of Palm Beach was a built-out community. The data was being collected to address sustainability and managed growth. Ms. Coniglio thought that when a discussion was held, that needed to be correlated to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gilbane agreed with Ms. Coniglio. He said the town was in a situation where it was a regional destination.

Mr. Bergman said the description of the regulatory document was perfect. He explained what was required by the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Coniglio called for public comment.

Anne Pepper, 333 Seaspray Avenue, addressed the declaration of use agreements and did not believe it was how to manage the intensification of the use of restaurants and bars since code enforcement was not around after a certain time. She thought the burden fell on the neighbors.

VIII. **COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSIONERS**

There were no comments heard at this time.

IX. **COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING AND ZONING BUILDING DIRECTOR**

Mr. Bergman discussed the proposed work plan and schedule. He said the Commission may want to consider having special meetings. He asked the Commission to review the proposed work plan and schedule and let staff know if it was workable. The goal was to start presenting the revised code to the Commissions and Town Council in November and December.

X. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion made by Mr. Spaziani and seconded by Mr. Kleid to adjourn the meeting at 1:03 p.m. Motion carried without the benefit of a roll call.

Respectfully Submitted,


Gail Coniglio, Chair
Town of Palm Beach
Planning & Zoning Commission

kmc