



Town Document Library

Adobe

Document

Document Name	AprMinutes202004	Subject	April 20th 2004 Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes for 2003-2004 Zoning Hearings	Date	Tue 04/20/2004
Directory	Zoning	Type	Minutes	Category	Zoning

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

2003-2004 ZONING HEARINGS

Tuesday, April 20, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

360 South County Road, Palm Beach

Town Council Chambers

I **Call to Order and Roll Call:** Chairman Kleid called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Richard M. Kleid, Chairman
Lowry M. Bell, Secretary
Peter S. Broberg, Member
Jorge A. Sanchez, Member
Joanna Golino, Member
Harrison M. Robertson, Member
Nancy M. Murray, Member
Elizabeth S. Murphy, Alternate Member
Susan Markin, Alternate Member
John Schuler, Alternate Member
John C. Randolph, Town Attorney (arrived at 9:37 a.m.)
Robert L. Moore, Director of Planning, Zoning & Building
Veronica B. Close, Asst. Dir. of Planning, Zoning & Building
Paul W. Castro, Zoning Administrator
Timothy M. Frank, Planning Administrator
William F. Brisson, Zoning Consultant

ABSENT: None

RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY: Cynthia M. Delp

II **Pledge of Allegiance**

III **Procedures for Input by the General Public:**

Mr. Kleid advised that any person wishing to be heard must state his name and address, and must limit comments to three (3) minutes. He asked for any members of the public who wished to be heard relative to any general matters related to the Planning and Zoning Commission business.

Mr. David Barton, 216 Jamaica Lane, addressed the Planning & Zoning Commission. He asked to be heard relative to the maximization study, and how to proceed with it. Mr. Kleid informed him that he could speak relative to this issue later in the agenda.

IV **Approval of the March 16, 2004, Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting:**

MOTION BY MR. BELL FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SANCHEZ.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

V **Consideration of Ordinance Regarding a Proposal to Regulate Political Signs :**

Mr. Castro explained that the Town Council has already decided that they want to regulate political signs, and the Planning and Zoning Commission is requested to review the draft ordinance as provided.

Mr. Kleid stated that with respect to time limit, (Section 6), it would be advisable to add a stipulation that the sign can only be placed 30 days in advance of an election. He also referenced the height, (Section 5), questioning whether the 4 foot height maximum was intended to include only the height of the sign, or the height of the sign plus supports. Mr. Randolph responded that the intent of the wording is to include the sign plus its supports. Mr. Bell suggested substituting the word “plus” with the word “including”. Mr. Randolph cautioned that the ordinance must be constitutional and content neutral, and that political signs can have no greater restrictions than any other residential signs. Persons must be permitted to display their political messages.

Relative to permission to place the signs on private property, (Section 3), there was a question whether the permission could be oral or needed to be written. Mr. Randolph responded that oral permission is intended.

Mr. Sanchez questioned whether the ordinance is clear that the owner of the sign is responsible for abiding by regulations for time limits and placement. Mr. Randolph thought that it was clear, but he felt that the forty-eight (48) hour time period specified in Section 6 would most likely have to be extended.

Ms. Markin commented about the size of the sign permitted, i.e., (6) square feet as shown in Section 1. She advocated trying to make the signs smaller. Mr. Randolph admitted that a size reduction is already being considered at the Town Council level.

Mr. Norman Goldblum, Town Council Member, 109 Everglades Avenue, stated that property owners should be required to give written permission for placement of political signs on their property. He felt that oral permission is unacceptable.

Mr. Robertson questioned why the Planning and Zoning Commission should vote relative to this matter if the ordinance is not yet in its final form. Mr. Randolph responded that there may be no need for the ordinance to return to the Planning and Zoning Commission, if the commission has looked favorably on the concept of the ordinance. Any specific recommendations for changes to the draft ordinance can be passed on to the Town Council by motion.

Mrs. Golino referred to Section 1 (4), and asked how commercial districts are regulated relative to political signs. Mr. Randolph responded that existing code provisions for signs in commercial districts apply in that situation.

Mr. Schuler stated his opinion that the final version of the ordinance should come back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for another review. Mr. Kleid agreed that the concept should be approved, together with making certain recommendations and a request that the Town Council re-submit the newly drafted ordinance to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MOTION BY MR. BELL STATING THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT OF THE ORDINANCE, WITH THE SUGGESTIONS THAT THE TOWN ATTORNEY WILL STUDY LIMITING THE MAXIMUM SIZE TO A SIZE LOWER THAN PROVIDED IN THE DRAFT ORDINANCE; THAT THE TOWN ATTORNEY WILL STUDY THE PROVISION FOR CORNER LOTS SO THEY ARE TREATED THE SAME AS REAL ESTATE SIGNS ON A CORNER LOT; THAT THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF THE SIGN, INCLUDING THE APPARATUS, NOT EXCEED FOUR (4) FEET; THAT THERE BE A PROVISION TO PREVENT POLITICAL SIGNS FROM BEING PLACED SOONER THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO AN ELECTION; THAT THE TOWN ATTORNEY REVIEW THE LEGALITY OF THE 48 HOUR TIME PERIOD STIPULATED FOR REMOVAL OF THE SIGNS; AND TO INCLUDE A PROVISION THAT CONSENT FOR PLACEMENT OF POLITICAL SIGNS BE REQUIRED TO BE WRITTEN CONSENT FROM THE PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS ALLOWING THE SIGN TO BE PLACED ON HIS PROPERTY.

(MR. KLEID NOTED THAT THE ONLY RECOMMENDATION DISCUSSED WHICH WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE MOTION IS THAT THE ORDINANCE, WHEN FINALIZED, SHOULD RETURN TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION FOR REVIEW.)

MOTION SECONDED BY MRS. GOLINO.

MOTION CARRIED 6-1-0, WITH MR. BROBERG VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION.

VI **Staff Presentation of the 2003-2004 Zoning Season (Ordinance #1-04, 2-04, 5-04 and 7-04)**

Mr. Castro reviewed several items which had been reviewed and recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission and then ultimately approved by the Town Council in Ordinances 1-04, 2-04, 5-04, and 7-04. Copies of each ordinance were distributed to the members for reference.

Mrs. Murray noted that in Ordinance 1-04, Section 1, (1), c., the wording is unclear in specifying for whom the best possible view of the ocean is being provided. It was her opinion that it should be clarified to state that the best possible view of the ocean is being provided for the public. She also mentioned that there was a typographical error in Section 22.

VII **Comments regarding next year's study items :**

Mr. Castro also mentioned that several items have been deferred to next season for re-study. They are as follows:

1. Non-conforming buildings and uses to be re-studied by staff, pursuant to Town Council direction
2. Conservation District for submerged land to be re-studied by staff under zoning in progress
3. Off-street parking for multi-family uses to be re-studied by staff
4. Maximization Study

Mr. Castro stated that the maximization study is perhaps the most important item for re-study. The Planning and Zoning Commission had seen the consultant's presentation relative to pervious/impervious area, size, scale, and compatibility. The Planning and Zoning Commission made certain recommendations to the Town Council at that time. Staff is working with the consultants to revise their original presentation to include a CCR of 3.5 together with elevating the structures to minimum flood elevation. The revised presentation will return to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Town Council during the next zoning season. In addition, and in response to the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the concept of a neighborhood index will be studied using 7-8 streets within the Town which are characteristically different from each other. Staff will also be looking at the specific zoning districts as they relate to pervious and impervious areas, and landscaped open space requirements as they relate to lot coverage on those properties.

Ms. Murphy requested that when the consultants revise their presentation, that in all aspects of the presentation, the color of the ground not be shown as green so it does not give the appearance or suggestion that it is landscaped area.

Mrs. Golino inquired whether the study of lot coverage will include an attempt to restrict hardscape. Mr. Castro replied that staff will look at restricting hardscape. She also commented that when the neighborhood index is considered, a square foot comparison is really what is needed rather than another

ratio. This is especially important in the case of aggregate lots. Mr. Castro asked for consensus from the commission relative to the subject of aggregate lots. He questioned whether the Planning and Zoning Commission is truly concerned over the larger house which would typically be the by-product of aggregate lots, especially since there was little concern relative to the same subject when the Sea streets were reviewed. He added that the code provides that if the lot size is over 20,000 square feet, the lot coverage is limited to 25%, a reduced CCR, greater setbacks, and other more stringent requirements than those pertaining to smaller sized lots.

Mr. Sanchez commented relative to the neighborhood index, asking that care be taken not to restrict the property owners to an average for a given street.

Mr. Bell thought the consultant's presentation would be a more fair evaluation if landscaping was added. Mr. Castro responded that landscaping is very subjective, and staff was trying to stay away from softening the effect of the presentation with landscaping. Several members agreed with Mr. Castro on this point.

Mr. Castro, again, called for consensus from the Planning and Zoning Commission as to whether they want staff to be studying further restrictions on accumulated lots so they are not out of character with the neighborhood. Mrs. Murray recalled that this subject had been previously visited by the commission. Mr. Kleid referenced the March 16, 2004 memorandum from Robert L. Moore to the Mayor and Town Council, Planning and Zoning Commission Recommendation, (2), "To study the introduction of a neighborhood average index for all Town streets in the R-B zoning district to limit the size of houses on the larger lots or on lot assemblages (approximately 13,000 square feet in area or whatever is determined to be the appropriate number) in the R-B zoning district." It was noted that rather than studying the index for **all** Town streets, only **representative** Town streets should be studied.

Ms. Markin suggested that staff look at specifically how many lots can be aggregated into one parcel, and what size house can be built on that aggregated lot. Mr. Broberg stated that he disagrees completely with the creation of further restrictions for large lots, as the code already addresses larger lots. He added that he did a personal tour of the north end from East Inlet to Jamaica, and he was not surprised by the number of new and larger homes, but he was surprised by the number of homes in terrible condition that really need to be torn down. Remodeling these homes is impacted by the 50% rule and also by FEMA regulations, so demolition is often requested.

Mr. Moore asked for further clarification in concert with Mr. Castro's call for consensus on aggregate lots. He offered two examples for a two story house in the R-B Zoning District using existing

regulations:

<u>10,000 square foot lot</u>	<u>20,000 square foot lot</u>
30 % Lot Coverage = 3,000 sq. ft. footprint	25% Lot Coverage = 5,000 sq. ft. footprint
40% Landscaped Area = 3,000 sq. ft.	50% Landscaped Area = 10,000 sq. ft.
30% Hardscape Area = 3,000 sq. ft.	25% Hardscape Area = 5,000 sq. ft.
<i>(Note:Mr. Moore later added total building area figures to this information, as follows :)</i>	
3,650 square feet in total bldg. area*	7,100 square feet in total bldg. area*
(*with 22 ft. high ceilings)	(*with 22 ft. high ceilings)

He asked if the above represent situations which are objectionable to the Planning and Zoning Commission. If not, staff should not expend any further effort to create additional restrictions to the code. Mr. Kleid called for comments from the commission. Mr. Bell stated that there should still be an attempt to reduce the amount of hardscape. Mr. Moore responded that staff is already working toward that aim, but there are already controls in place to deal with larger houses on accumulated lots. Mr. Bell stated that he agrees with Mr. Broberg that the existing code provisions are working fine as is.

Mr. Sanchez stated that we will continue to deal with these problems until we do a region by region, or overlay study, and he felt that the greatest problem concerns the inflexibility of established setbacks. The existing setback regulations make smaller houses appear larger to the public, with more mass and hardscape.

Mrs. Golino reiterated her feeling that it is important to study the maximum square feet allowable on aggregate lots to ensure compatibility within the neighborhood.

Mr. David Barton addressed the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that in keeping with listing items for study next year, the area of town where Publix is located requires immediate study, as Publix needs to be expanded. Moving on to the topic at hand, Mr. Barton commented that tinkering with the CCR is not the answer. He distributed five handwritten questions which he felt should be answered prior to making zoning changes:

1. What overarching public policies pertain?
2. What general land uses apply?
3. What infrastructure limitations will be impacted?

4. How will Town building regulations be impacted?
5. Are current designated zoning districts adequate?

Mr. Barton expressed several opinions: That there are plenty of small homes in the north end which are being renovated; that it is incorrect to assume that all owners of smaller homes are unhappy with their homes and/or consider them unworkable; that residents' preferences for what type of house is desirable is less important than protecting the land from being over-built, together with its impact on the infrastructure; that the Planning and Zoning Commission must find a way to halt over-building, not enable it; and that the method to do this is through policy and not market driven factors and pressures. He called for a detailed long range land use plan as was previously requested by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He also called for the preservation of the four basic and distinct living areas of Palm Beach, each having its own amenities, i.e., the South end, the Estate section, the in-town section with its mix of residential and commercial, and the north end. Mr. Barton stated that water is the greatest threat to Palm Beach, too much or too little of same, and drainage problems have a direct correlation to lot coverage. He asked that the maximization study be performed in a more comprehensive manner; that it be more objective utilizing the services of an appointed task force who would take demographics and public opinion into account; and that it be more instructive including independent recommendations. Finally, he suggested that to protect the neighborhoods, zoning in progress should be declared for all lots 12,000 square feet or less.

Mr. Moore reminded everyone, including the staff and the public, that the Strategic Plan recognizes that change will occur in the town, but the change is to be managed by the Planning and Zoning Commission, with subsequent Town Council approval, so that any given street experiences evolution rather than revolution.

Ms. Markin stated that she agreed with Mr. Broberg that it is unlikely that five lots would be joined together, but as a Planning and Zoning Commission, the worst case scenarios should be addressed in the code to protect the neighborhoods.

Mr. Kleid called for a member of the commission to sponsor a motion relative to the aforementioned subjects, but no motion was made. Mr. Moore clarified that staff has been given direction by the Town Council to choose and study seven or eight streets and their characteristics. He also thought it would be a good idea to look at the maximum square feet allowed as suggested by Mrs. Golino, and include that in the study. Mr. Sanchez asked if that would include a study of the existing setbacks. Mr. Moore responded that staff has not been directed to increase setbacks. Mr. Sanchez felt that flexible setbacks are very important to enhancing good architecture within the town.

Mr. Kleid noted that the Town Council, at its last meeting, directed the Planning and Zoning Commission to study the delegation of authority from the Town Council to either the Planning and Zoning Commission, or another commission to be created, to hear variances and special exceptions. This will be a study item for next zoning season.

Mr. Kleid questioned whether this study will be performed by staff or in conjunction with an outside consultant. Mr. Brooks, at the Town Council meeting, felt that it should be done in a workshop context with Mr. Randolph, Mr. Moore, Ms. Close, Mr. Castro, an outside expert, and concerned residents attending. At that same meeting, the Palm Beach Civic Association stated that they had previously commissioned an attorney from Boca, Mr. Charles Siemon, to study variances. Mr. Siemon's study is scheduled to be completed during the summer for submission to the Town Council. Mr. Kleid thought it would be a good idea for the Planning and Zoning Commission to receive the findings of that study prior to the next zoning season, and that Mr. Siemon appear at a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to discuss the study. Further, he wondered if the Planning and Zoning Commission should ask the Town Council to expand Mr. Siemon's study to include a study of the possible change in delegation of authority to review variances and special exceptions.

Mr. Castro stated that it is staff's intention to work in cooperation with the Civic Association, and to mutually share information to arrive at a recommendation. Staff does, however, intend to use Adley, Brisson and Engman, Mr. Bill Brisson, to review these issues. Mr. Castro stated that experience has shown that Mr. Brisson has always given his own objective and independent recommendations to the Town, which may not necessarily agree with staff opinions.

Mr. Schuler stated that there is a lack of innovative architecture in the Town, and current variances granted often relate to the creation of mega-mansions. He advocated that staff study the setbacks in an effort to foster more unique architecture, particularly in the north end. Mr. Sanchez agreed that the root problem goes back to setback limitations. Mrs. Murray stated that she made some inquiries on her own relative to variances and special exceptions in other areas of the country, explaining how much of the Town Council's time is expended in these reviews. Someone suggested to her that if that much time is being spent, the zoning code needs to be re-written. Mrs. Murray, however, stated that she believes the zoning code does work, but the number of variances and special exceptions being approved does not allow us to see whether it really works.

Mr. Ned Barnes, President of the Palm Beach Civic Association, stated that the study is in progress, and preliminary results show some creative possibilities to address these issues. He encouraged the Planning and Zoning Commission to keep all options open to explore new ways to handle these issues. Mr. Barnes added that the Civic Association is merely trying to be helpful in this regard, as they are with respect to all Town government issues. Mr. Siemon's study will review variances issued over the past seven years, looking for patterns and suggesting how the process can be improved. He will make comparisons to how variances and special exceptions are handled in other areas of the country. Mr. Kleid questioned, and Mr. Barnes confirmed, that Mr. Siemon's study will not deal with the delegation of authority, although that could be addressed in the future.

Mr. Kleid asked if there are any other items for study next year. Mr. Castro responded asking the Planning and Zoning Commission to review the eight planning areas established in the Comp Plan over the summer in preparation for making recommendations in November as to whether they are still appropriate; whether there are too many, or not enough; or, whether changes are required. There are a few items that need to be completed relative to the Strategic Plan. Staff will study and report back to

the Planning and Zoning Commission relative to certain traffic signage. Staff will also recommend that the retaining wall/fence provision, adopted four years ago, be re-visited. There are also several housekeeping matters which will be brought forward, as well as any other matters the Planning and Zoning Commission would like to add. These study items will be brought forward to the Town Council at their May meeting for approval.

Mrs. Golino suggested a study item related to bonus zoning as a means to alleviate setbacks, and ideally, this should be studied in conjunction with a reduction in the CCR to 3.5. She felt that if bonus zoning was available, it would be an impetus to developers and architects to achieve larger houses with more interesting architecture due to setback variations. Mr. Moore stated that this had been studied once before, but it can certainly be studied again. (Please note that a motion relative to bonus zoning follows the next paragraph.)

Mrs. Markin brought up the subject of large buses which are often pulled over in town, at all hours of the day with the motor running, and with perhaps only 1-2 passengers on board. As such, the buses are a source of residents' complaints. Similarly, there is a continuing problem with surfers parking illegally in the town, regardless of whether a ticket is issued or not. The tickets are ultimately paid, but the streets are still left with these illegally parked vehicles. She suggested that since issuing tickets does not eliminate the problem, perhaps a more aggressive approach like towing the vehicles is the answer. Also, with the impact of all the construction in West Palm Beach, there will undoubtedly be increased bicycle traffic into the town. Mr. Moore stated that the Town Council is looking at the issue of the buses, having instructed Mr. Elwell to contact CoTran to consider the possibility of reducing the size of the buses coming into town. As for the influx of persons into the town, it is difficult to restrict the amount of people entering the town.

Mr. Castro requested a motion relative to the bonus zoning, if that was the desire of the commission.

MOTION BY MRS. GOLINO TO ASK STAFF TO STUDY BONUS ZONING.

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. BROBERG.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VIII Discussion of Mission Statement for the Planning and Zoning Commission:

Mr. Kleid explained that the Town Council has asked the Planning and Zoning Commission to re-draft their previous mission statement. Mr. Kleid submitted a suggested version of the mission statement to the commission members for discussion and review. He stated that he used the language from the December 10, 2003 Planning and Zoning Commission workshop, and the comments made at the March 26, 2004 special Town Council meeting.

Let the record show that at this point in the meeting,
Mr. Castro distributed an Excerpt from the
Minutes of the regular Town Council meeting
held on April 13, 2004 to the members. The

excerpt deals with the consideration of potential delegation of authority to review Special Exceptions and Variances. Mr. Kleid had also prepared written

comments relative to this subject, and those were also distributed to the members.

Relative to Mr. Kleid's draft, Ms. Murphy noted that in paragraphs 1 and 3, the word "development" might be changed to "re-development."

Mrs. Golino noted, in paragraph 4 of Mr. Kleid's draft, that "the commission should take a pro active role in developing methodology for evaluating the built environment as it relates to commission goals." Her comment was that before any methodology can be developed, the Planning and Zoning Commission must always seek approval from the Town Council for funding of the studies. She questioned how the commission could take a pro-active role if permission must first be secured. Mr. Kleid responded that he has also suggested that monies be budgeted to allow the Planning and Zoning Commission to undertake studies which may require either temporary staff or a consultant.

Ms. Murphy noted an extra period in paragraph 4 of the draft, and that the word "commission" should be capitalized throughout. She asked whether funding has been approved for commission member continuing education. Ms. Close responded that such funding was approved.

Ms. Markin suggested that the Planning and Zoning Commission meet face to face with the Town Council to decide what the mission of the commission should be, rather than having multiple versions of the mission statement go back and forth between the two groups. Mr. Kleid asked if any other members feel that a workshop with the Town Council is merited, along with a separate meeting with ARCOM and the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Mr. Robertson stated that the code provides that the Town Council be the planning agency for the Town of Palm Beach. He suggested that the mission statement be amended to reflect that the Planning and Zoning Commission is to be the planning agency of the Town, and that the necessary powers be given to the commission to effectuate those duties. Mr. Moore responded that such a major change would best be discussed at the joint workshop which has been suggested. Mr. Robertson replied that it has been a year since the word "Planning" has been added to the name of the commission, but that is the extent of it. He called for the code to be amended to provide that the Planning and Zoning Commission is the planning agency for the town, and stated it should be done immediately. Mr. Frank noted that without any changes in procedure, the Planning and Zoning Commission is the advisory commission on planning. He noted that when the Comp Plan is scheduled for review by the Planning and Zoning Commission, the commission will look at all elements of the Comp Plan and make recommendations to the Town Council.

Mr. Kleid requested that the discussion return to the mission statement, and asked for a motion for approval. Mr. Robertson stated that he did not like the third paragraph because it states that the "commission shall **follow** the concepts and contents of the Town's Comprehensive Plan," when it would

more appropriately read “shall **originate and monitor** the concepts and contents....” Mr. Moore attempted to clarify that the major mission of the Planning and Zoning Commission is to establish and monitor the Future Land Use in the Town of Palm Beach, and this is a very large responsibility. Also, in conjunction with the Evaluation and Appraisal Report for the Comp Plan, the Planning and Zoning Commission will have much work to do. However, other issues which are typically handled by the LPA, would more appropriately be handled by the Town Council, Town Manager, staff and perhaps, other boards or commissions, rather than the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Randolph entered into the conversation relative to the mission statement saying that the mission statement, as drafted, does need some changes, and he noted paragraph 3 of the draft as a particular example of the need for change. Paragraph 3 seems to omit that the Planning and Zoning Commission is already involved in the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested that it be amended to state that “The commission shall study and be involved with the formulation and amendment of the Town’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan,” and then follow with the remainder of the suggested verbiage. Mr. Castro requested that staff be permitted to take the draft, and based on the comments heard today, revise the mission statement for further discussion at the May meeting.

MOTION BY MR. BELL TO REFER THE MISSION STATEMENT TO STAFF FOR REVISIONS, AND TO BRING THE REVISED MISSION STATEMENT BACK TO THE MAY MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

**MOTION SECONDED BY MR. SANCHEZ.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

IX **Setting a date for a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for May to consider Staff’s recommendation to change the intersection vision regulations in Chapter 134, Zoning**

After discussion, it was decided that the May meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 18, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

As for the upcoming season, it was decided that the first meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission dealing with planning issues will be held on Thursday, November 4, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

Other meeting dates tentatively scheduled are as follows:

Wednesday, December 1, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

Thursday, December 2, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

Thursday, December 16, 2004 at 9:30 a.m.

Tuesday, April 19, 2005 at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Castro noted that additional meetings may be required as necessary. He advised the members that, due to a Code Enforcement Board meeting, the December 16, 2004 meeting may be subject to change.

X **Any other items :**

Mr. Kleid asked the members if they would like he and the staff to attempt to schedule a joint workshop meeting with the Town Council, and a second workshop with ARCOM and the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC). Mr. Sanchez responded that it would be most important to have a joint meeting with ARCOM and the LPC. Other members felt it was a priority to meet with the Town Council. So, hearing no objections to either joint meeting, Mr. Kleid stated he will pursue this.

XI **Adjournment:**

**THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:47 A.M. UPON A MOTION BY MR. BELL.
(THERE WAS NO SECOND TO THE MOTION.)**

Richard M. Kleid, Chairman

Planning and Zoning Commission
Zoning Commission

Lowry M. Bell, Jr.

Secretary

Planning and

cmd