

LPA / PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 4, 2016

The Local Planning Agency / Planning and Zoning Board held a regular meeting on Thursday, February 4, 2016 in the City Commission Chambers, 210 Sams Avenue, New Smyrna Beach, Florida. Chairperson Steven Casserly called the meeting to order at 6:30p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present:

Travous Dever
Stephen Sather
Pat Arvidson
Steven Casserly
Kelly Azzinaro

Ian Ratliff and Jamie Calkins were absent. Also present were Chief Planner Jeff Gove; Planner Robert Mathen; Planner Steve Bapp; Board Secretary Tammy Dickerson and members of the public.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Dever, seconded by Ms. Azzinaro, to approve the minutes of the regular January 4, 2016, Planning and Zoning Board meeting. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote, 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. V-3-15: 176 Corbin Park Rd / Capuano
Vincenzo Capuano, 4311 Sea Mist Drive, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169 owner and applicant requests variances in order to construct a new 150 seat restaurant as follows:
1. Reduce the required build-to line from SR 44 from 45-65 feet to 40 feet including a 15 foot utility easement
 2. Reduce the second front yard set back (from Corbin Rd) from 25 feet to 21 feet
 3. Reduce the side (south) buffer from 7 to 2 feet
 4. Reduce the required parking space dimensions from 10 feet by 20 feet to 9 feet by 18 feet
 5. Reduce the minimum parking aisle width from 22 feet to 20 feet
 6. Reduce the parking area interior landscaping from 20 percent to 8 percent
 7. Reduce the side yard (west) setback from 25 feet to 10 feet.

Chairman Casserly swore in Mr. Bapp. Mr. Bapp stated his qualifications and educational background and he was qualified as an expert witness. Mr. Bapp reviewed staffs' findings and stated that staff recommended staff recommends denial. However,

should the Board determine that all seven variance criteria have been satisfied, staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied to the Board's approval:

1. Reduce the required build-to line from SR 44 from 45-65 feet to 40 feet including 15 foot utility easement limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan;
2. Reduce the second front yard set back (from Corbin Rd) from 25 feet to 21 feet limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan;
3. Reduce the required parking space dimensions from 10 feet by 20 feet to 9 feet by 18 feet, all required handicapped parking will not be granted a reduction in size, and parking space variance granted only if written contract and easement granting access to parking area from the bank access road;
4. Reduce the minimum parking aisle width from 22 feet to 20 feet only upon approval of the City Fire Marshall and upon Plan Review Committee review and full approval of a site plan;
5. Reduce the parking area interior landscaping from 20 percent to 8 percent, only if replaced with square footage of landscaping on remaining portion of property equal to that of the reduction;
6. Reduce the side yard (west) setback from 25 feet to 10 feet limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan; and
7. All granted variances expire two years from Planning and Zoning Board approval if a building permit is not granted from the Chief Building Official.

Mr. Sather asked if the applicant had gone before the Plan Review Committee yet.

Mr. Bapp stated that they had not that isn't required by the applicant before they apply for a variance.

David Evans, Evans Engineering, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that the owner of the property is proposing an Italian restaurant on this site. He stated that after the owner met with us we went through probably 15 conceptual plans and we met with staff several times and he had also met with them prior to that. He stated that we met with staff several times in order to come to this meeting with a staff recommendation. He stated that we had talked to the previous planning manager about this plan and were advised to come before this Board for the variances that were needed for this project. He stated that the owner knows what he needs to have on the property in order to be successful and that would be a 150 seat restaurant. He stated that 60 parking spaces are needed per code for a 150 seat restaurant. He stated that we knew we had to put 60 spaces on the plan and in order to do that we had to reduce the size of the parking spaces to 18' x 9'. He stated that these size parking spaces are in other areas of the city and working fine. He stated that the building is odd shaped and we understand the build to line is 45 feet and we are at 40 feet. He stated that the utilities easement was discussed with the Utilities Commission and we have what they need for that. He stated that the side setback line on Corbin Park Road was 25 feet and we are at 21 feet. He stated that staff had suggested that it would be better if there wasn't a septic tank on the site so the owner went to property owner to the south and he is working that out with them. He stated that staff had suggested we meet with Volusia County about the access off of Corbin Park Road or SR 44 and they had suggested that

we work with the bank owner about getting access that way so they did and the owner has an agreement with the bank and that will be submitted with the site plan. He stated that there are special circumstances on this property it's a small narrow site.

Mr. Dever asked if they were in the process of meeting with the neighboring property regarding the city sewer.

Mr. Evans stated that they were doing that.

Mr. Sather asked where it would be coming from.

Mr. Evans stated that there is an access road to the south near a townhome project that has a manhole lateral on the property.

Mr. Dever asked if there is already an ingress / egress through the bank property.

Mr. Evans stated that was correct.

Mr. Sather asked how long will that be for.

Mr. Evans stated that they are still working that out.

Ms. Arvidson asked with all the landscape buffering on SR44 where will they put their sign.

Mr. Dever stated that there is an existing pole sign on the site that sunsets in 2021 and then it will have to be replaced with a monument sign.

Mr. Evans stated that was correct they plan to use the pole sign but rehabilitate the sign.

Elizabeth Bell, 412 Shorewood Lane, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. She stated that she lives in Hidden Pines development where the applicant stated that they plan to access the restaurant from and there is already a problem with traffic on this road. She stated that they have been working with FDOT for over two years trying to get a traffic signal there and now there will be more traffic accessing that road. She stated that FDOT's long range plan is to close the left hand turn off of Corbin Park Road on to SR44 and that is another item of concern and we don't want to route more people through our development.

Mr. Dever asked if there will be traffic studies done before this is developed.

Mr. Bapp stated that was correct.

Noralee Gillespie, 2263 Candlewood Lane, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. She stated that we need a right hand turn only coming out of Hidden Pines Boulevard. She was concerned about where they will be putting their stormwater.

Mr. Dever asked if the stormwater would have to be approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Bapp stated that was correct.

Donna Athearn, 684 Corbin Park Road, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. She stated that she has worked with Volusia County in the past to keep the Turnbull creek clean and the ditch along Paige Avenue for the stormwater drainage issues. She stated that the county has been very helpful for that. She stated that Corbin Park Road isn't ready for this kind of traffic from the restaurant it's a very narrow road. She stated that they are also concerned about the service vehicles that will be coming from the restaurant. She stated that everyone is connected to septic tanks in Corbin Park Road and if they can't do that than it should be an absolute no for the project.

Randy Herman, 108 Esther Street, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that some of these concerns could have been worked out if they went to the PRC before the variance request. He stated that the site is large enough for a substantial size restaurant that there is no need for these variances. He was concerned about the fact that they want to reduce the landscaping from 20% to 8% and their explanation is they will mitigate.

Mr. Dever stated that the residents made valid points and he is sure these are concerns of the Board also but these will all be addressed during site plan approval. He stated that this site is a very difficult site to work with for development and makes it a very unique site.

Mr. Sather stated that he also views the site as unique. He discussed the different variances that they were requesting and that they weren't major differences in the allowed requirements. He stated that these are small requests for a nice development that will be on this property.

Ms. Arvidson stated that she didn't see why the restaurant couldn't be reduced in size and asked if the lunch traffic wouldn't be conflicting with the bank traffic during their busy time.

Ms. Azzinaro stated that the reduction of the south buffer wasn't addressed in the staff recommendations.

Mr. Bapp stated that in the corridor lay zone the side property buffering isn't considered if the property abuts another property.

Chairman Casserly stated that the proposal didn't go before the PRC yet and it might add to the variances after they go before the PRC. He stated that he didn't think the parcel was that difficult to work with it's difficult because the owner wants to build a 150 seat restaurant.

Mr. Evans stated that we applied for the variance first because we needed to know what are directives were when designing the site for the site plan approval process. He stated that the reason for 150 seat restaurant is because that is the minimum amount of seating for a full liquor license. He stated that the size of the building isn't excessive for this site. He stated that an exfiltration plan has already been designed for the site. He stated that there will be traffic studies done for the project and will have to get approval

from FDOT also. He stated that we know there will be deliveries and we will work with the suppliers to deliver at certain times. He stated that as far as the lunch crowd competing with the banks business the lunch crowd is a lot smaller than the dinner crowd. He stated that we want to work with the residents and there is sanitary sewer on the back side of the property so they have no intention of using a septic tank. He stated that they plan to use Corbin Park for their in and out access of the property.

Motion by Mr. Dever, seconded by Ms. Azzinaro, to approve the requested variances with the following conditions:

- 1. Reduce the required build-to line from SR 44 from 45-65 feet to 40 feet including 15 foot utility easement limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan;**
- 2. Reduce the second front yard set back (from Corbin Rd) from 25 feet to 21 feet limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan;**
- 3. Reduce the required parking space dimensions from 10 feet by 20 feet to 9 feet by 18 feet, all required handicapped parking will not be granted a reduction in size, and parking space variance granted only if written contract and easement granting access to parking area from the bank access road;**
- 4. Reduce the minimum parking aisle width from 22 feet to 20 feet only upon approval of the City Fire Marshall and upon Plan Review Committee review and full approval of a site plan;**
- 5. Reduce the parking area interior landscaping from 20 percent to 8 percent, only if replaced with square footage of landscaping on remaining portion of property equal to that of the reduction;**
- 6. Reduce the side yard (west) setback from 25 feet to 10 feet limited to the portion of the building as shown on the submitted site plan; and**
- 7. All granted variances expire two years from Planning and Zoning Board approval if a building permit is not granted from the Chief Building Official.**

Motion passed on a roll call vote, 3-2 with Mr. Casserly and Ms. Arvidson dissenting.

NEW BUSINESS

B. NEW SMYRNA CHRYSLER – DODGE – JEEP – RAM / SR 44

Glenn D. Storch, 420 South Nova Road, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114, applicant on behalf of Mitchell Equity Group LLLP, P O Box 2180, New Smyrna Beach, Florida 32170, request variances to construct a new commercial building or an automotive dealership as follows:

- 1. A variance for the minimum open space requirement to be 25 % in lieu of 50 %;**
- 2. A variance for the natural vegetation requirement to be 15 % in lieu of 30 %;**
- 3. A variance for the maximum building height to be 45 feet in lieu of 35 feet;**
- 4. A variance for the required on-site parking to be 43 spaces in lieu of 147 spaces;**

5. A variance for a the second permitted monument sign to be 48 square feet in lieu of 24 square feet;
6. A variance to require no more than thirty-six (36) 2 ½ inch caliper replacement hardwood trees per acre, in lieu of the requirements of the LDR;
7. A variance to allow preservation of 15 specimen trees in lieu of 16;
8. A variance for tree mitigation costs to be determined based on the actual cost of purchasing, planting and maintaining an approved species of 2 ½ inch caliper replacement hardwood tree, in lieu of \$500.00 per 2 ½ inch caliper hardwood; and
9. In the event a build-to line is required for the east property line along Glencoe Road, a variance for said east build-to line to be 25 – 850 feet in lieu of 25 feet.

The subject property is zoned PUD and is in the SR 44 Corridor Overlay Zone (COZ), contains approximately 12 acres, and is generally located north of SR-44 and west of North Glencoe Road. (VCPA # 7323-02-01-0080).

Mr. Dever stated that he would have to abstain from the vote that he represents the developer.

Chairman Casserly and Mr. Sather stated that they both met with the representatives regarding the development.

Chairman Casserly swore in Mr. Gove. Mr. Gove stated his qualifications and educational background and he was qualified as an expert witness. Mr. Gove reviewed staffs' findings and stated that staff recommended staff recommends denial. However, should the Board determine that all seven variance criteria have been satisfied, staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied to the Board's approval:

- 1) The requested building height of 45' be limited to the specific area shown on the Exhibit E building rendering, and that more detailed information be provided to document this limitation beyond that color rendering.
- 2) Should the Board determine that any variance requests for landscape/open space areas meet all of the criteria for approval, a condition of that approval should be that larger-sized plants be used in order to enhance any reduced areas and amount of landscape materials and/or open space, including a minimum of 4" cal. for all trees to be installed as replacement trees.
- 3) If the developer is permitted to pay actual replacement costs into the City tree mitigation fund instead of the amount defined in the LDR, those costs shall be fully documented and certified when submitted for City review and approval, with that to occur prior to the issuance of any temporary and/or permanent Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for the subject property.
- 4) The applicant revises the pending PUD Master Development Agreement to include any new or amended language based on approval or denial of these requested variances, and that such changes are submitted prior to the PUD rezoning request being scheduled for any future public hearings.

- 5) Any approved variances expire two years from the date of Planning and Zoning Board approval if a building permit for this proposed project (as shown on Exhibit C) is not issued by the City Building Department.

Glenn Storch, applicant and attorney, stated his name for the record. He stated that this property does meet the requirements of a special circumstance. He stated that if the variance is denied it would deny the owner reasonable use of their property. He stated that when this property was annexed in the city a PUD was allowed with flexibility but that has changed and now there is not flexibility with a PUD and a developer has to meet the land development codes the reason for the variance request instead for those flexible issues. He stated that in a 12-acre parcel you can't apply the wetland to the request that is the reason for the variance request. He stated that 1/3 of the property can't be used it has to remain as natural vegetation. He stated that since the property was annexed more stormwater is required also on the parcel. He stated that the requirement for 147 customer parking spaces makes no sense and isn't needed for a car dealership. He stated that out of 147 customer parking 113 are required for people dropping their cars off for service. He stated that at best only 6 parking spaces are needed for service. He stated that the requirements for this site would deny reasonable use of the property. He stated that we have added an additional conditions to upgrade the landscaping. He then discussed the following additional conditions that they have agreed to:

1. Frontage landscaping required by the City LDR shall be upgraded to minimum 4" caliper DBH oak and magnolia trees. Landscaping shall also be enhanced in front of the building area, but any tree location issues shall be addressed as part of the PUD process.
2. Customer parking areas shall be clearly identified on the proposed site plan and PUD concept plan. Customers display areas shall be clearly delineated as separate from customer parking areas.
3. Building height increase to 45' shall only be permitted within the single vehicle display area as provided on the concept plan elevation. Said area shall not be considered habitable, air conditioned space, and shall only be used for a single vehicle display.
4. Applicant has demonstrated that 37 customer parking spaces meets and / or exceeds the parking determined to be necessary for the total inventory parking requirement. The City LDR requires 37 customer parking spaces for the proposed inventory parking, and 113 parking spaces for the proposed maintenance stalls; however, applicant represents that only 6 spaces are required for the proposed maintenance stalls based on a forthcoming business plan. Applicant shall submit said business plan to justify the reduction for maintenance stall parking prior to site plan approval.
5. Biologist / Arborist shall conduct quality review of specimen trees, especially specimen bay trees, and determine viability of same. If one or more trees scheduled for removal is determined to be not viable, then such specimen tree variance shall not be necessary. In the event all 20 specimen trees are determined to be viable, then applicant is permitted to

relocate one specimen tree to a preservation or buffer area rather than remove said tree.

6. Applicant shall provide tree survey to staff indicating tree density.
7. Applicant shall provide actual tree costs (per 2 and ½ inch caliper DBH) within 30 days of site plan approval to determine additional tree mitigation cost.

Ms. Arvidson stated that she didn't understand the request for the increase in height to put a car on top of the building it would be obvious it's a car dealership and no need for a car on top of the building.

Mr. Storch stated that this the increase in height is part of an architectural feature.

Bruce and David Slothower, 2520 Selleck Avenue, were sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. David Slothower stated that this development will be abutting their property and they are worried about the reduction in vegetation and having a car dealership in their view when they walk out their front door. He stated that he is hoping there will be some kind of sound barrier for the residents in the neighborhood.

Ms. Arvidson asked where the Slothower's property was adjacent to the property.

David Slothower stated that the north end of this property backs up to Glencoe Church and their property backs up to the Glencoe Church.

Bruce Slothower stated that they like their privacy on their property and would like a sound barrier.

Mr. Herman sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that city staff prepares the staff reports and then the developer comes in and says they didn't have time and the planning process seems to occur at these meetings. He stated that the developers should do their work before they come to the city. He stated that the P&Z Board has stated that they don't set a precedence but he sees that happening such in the previous case by reducing more and more of the open space. He stated that the overview of development should come in to play when the Board makes their decisions. He stated that he believes this is a good development but if we continue to let all these variances go through it is working against the betterment of our community.

Danny Carter, representing the Glencoe Baptist Church at 196 North Glencoe Road, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that he is the pastor of the church and one of their concerns is a sound barrier especially on Sunday and if service will be open on Sunday.

Randall Patrick and Preston, 185 North Glencoe Road, were sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. Mrs. Preston stated that they are concerned about the lights shining in to their windows and their children's bedrooms, no vegetation buffer, increased traffic flow on Glencoe Road and lower their property value. Mr. Preston stated that he was concerned about the retention area in their front yard and will bring mosquitos to their front yard.

Stoney Fraley, 674 Mt Olympus Boulevard, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that he is concerned about the level of variances that this development is asking for with this property. He stated that the corridor overlay zone is to protect that area of NSB. He stated that this is an obliteration of natural vegetation. He stated that Home Depot, ABC, Dunkin Donut and Murphy Oil are all behind natural vegetation and everyone knows where they are. He stated that this development needs to modify how much of the vegetation that they want to do away with. He stated that its time the Board stops the greedy development that has been going on in this city for the last few years.

Ginger Hutchinson, 423 Glencoe Road, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. She stated that she thinks this is a good thing and supports this development.

Christine and Henry Gerson, 149 North Glencoe Road, were sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. Mrs. Gerson stated that they are concerned about the vegetation buffer and the lights coming off the property. She stated that she feels the vegetation should be a wooded vegetation such as it is now and not a 4 foot ligustrum shrub. She stated that this development needs to work with the residents. Mr. Gerson stated that he was concerned about what it will look like off of Glencoe Road.

Tom King, 150 North Timberlane Road, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that he was in favor of the project. He stated that something is going to go on this property and he would just prefer it be a dealership.

Dale Williams, 1048 Clubhouse Boulevard, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that the city's land development code needs to be rewritten and corridor overlay zone needs to be adjusted because it doesn't work with reality and doesn't make sense with normal development. He stated that because of the overlay zone being so overly restrictive the developments get their approval in the county and then annex in to the city. He stated that he likes this development and wants to the Board to find a method to correct the code.

Justin Glass, 627 Glencoe Road, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that development is going to happen and this development group is here to try and help with the resident's concerns. He stated that he maintains a lot of their properties and the owner does work with the neighbors with service closed on Sundays and the sales department doesn't open until 11am on Sundays.

Ron Wesley, 2484 Burnell Court, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that he was concerned about the mosquito ditch, the turn lane on Glencoe the traffic is already a mess there now, the lights, and the Chevy dealership has an exhaust fan running and concerned this dealership will also.

Stewart Mitchell was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that he was the owner of the project. He stated that Mr. Holcomb will bring a good project to this property and he will look after the community and employ people also. He stated that he hopes that the Board approves this development.

Mr. Storch stated that this is just the beginning stages of the approvals for this project. He stated that the 25 foot buffer will be heavily treed. He stated that we can fill in any holes with more vegetation. He stated that during the PUD process he will guarantee that the lights are shielded from the residents and keep the lights on this property. He stated that we can also make sure that there are no outside speakers and service won't be open on Sundays. He stated that the retention area will be a dry retention. He stated that the buffer on the front will be the same as what is in front of ABC, Home Depot and the other developments on SR44. He stated that the customer display area will be on Glencoe Road and there won't be access for customers on that side of the property and it will be gated. He stated that they will continue to work with the residents during their approval process.

Ms. Arvidson asked about the trees that they planned to put on the development.

Mr. Storch stated that we are only required to put 2 1/2" trees back on the frontage of the property but we plan to put 4" trees on the property.

Mr. Dever stated that when you talk about different uses that could be on this property a car dealership has a low impact on a neighborhood they aren't open late, no service on Sundays and very low traffic coming to a dealership.

Chairman Casserly stated that he could argue on each variance request on how they meet the criteria for the variance request. He stated that the benefit outweighs everything else on this request.

Mr. Sather stated that he would like to see the trees put in and maintained.

Mr. Storch stated that could be a provision that the trees will be maintained also.

Ms. Azzinaro asked about the clarification on the parking.

Ms. Arvidson asked where the 147 parking spaces came from.

Mr. Gove stated that is what they applied for and we don't know what it is based on.

Mr. Storch stated that we have the experience of how many parking spaces we need. He stated that the last thing we want to do is not have enough parking.

Mark Dowst, project engineer, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated that the parking space number came from 4 customer parking per maintenance stall. He stated that some are for paint, quick lube and the maintenance racks. Mr. Holcomb has been in the business and knows what he needs.

Jack Holcomb, 418 Quay Assisi, was sworn in to testify then addressed the Board. He stated the process for service and the need for parking spaces.

Motion by Mr. Sather, seconded by Ms. Azzinaro, to approve the requested variances with the following conditions:

- 1. The requested building height of 45' be limited to the specific area shown on the Exhibit E building rendering, and that more detailed information be provided to document this limitation beyond that color rendering.**
- 2. Should the Board determine that any variance requests for landscape/open space areas meet all of the criteria for approval, a condition of that approval should be that larger-sized plants be used in order to enhance any reduced areas and amount of landscape materials and/or open space, including a minimum of 4" cal. for all trees to be installed as replacement trees.**
- 3. If the developer is permitted to pay actual replacement costs into the City tree mitigation fund instead of the amount defined in the LDR, those costs shall be fully documented and certified when submitted for City review and approval, with that to occur prior to the issuance of any temporary and/or permanent Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for the subject property.**
- 4. The applicant revises the pending PUD Master Development Agreement to include any new or amended language based on approval or denial of these requested variances, and that such changes are submitted prior to the PUD rezoning request being scheduled for any future public hearings.**
- 5. Any approved variances expire two years from the date of Planning and Zoning Board approval if a building permit for this proposed project (as shown on Exhibit C) is not issued by the City Building Department.**
- 6. Frontage landscaping required by the City LDR shall be upgraded to minimum 4" caliper DBH oak and magnolia trees. Landscaping shall also be enhanced in front of the building area, but any tree location issues shall be addressed as part of the PUD process.**
- 7. Customer parking areas shall be clearly identified on the proposed site plan and PUD concept plan. Customers display areas shall be clearly delineated as separate from customer parking areas.**
- 8. Building height increase to 45' shall only be permitted within the single vehicle display area as provided on the concept plan elevation. Said area shall not be considered habitable, air conditioned space, and shall only be used for a single vehicle display.**
- 9. Applicant has demonstrated that 37 customer parking spaces meets and / or exceeds the parking determined to be necessary for the total inventory parking requirement. The City LDR requires 37 customer parking spaces for the proposed inventory parking, and 113 parking spaces for the proposed maintenance stalls; however, applicant represents that only 6 spaces are required for the proposed maintenance stalls based on a forthcoming business plan. Applicant shall submit said business plan to justify the reduction for maintenance stall parking prior to site plan approval.**

10. **Biologist / Arborist shall conduct quality review of specimen trees, especially specimen bay trees, and determine viability of same. If one or more trees scheduled for removal is determined to be not viable, then such specimen tree variance shall not be necessary. In the event all 20 specimen trees are determined to be viable, then applicant is permitted to relocate one specimen tree to a preservation or buffer area rather than remove said tree.**
11. **Applicant shall provide tree survey to staff indicating tree density.**
12. **Applicant shall provide actual tree costs (per 2 and ½ inch caliper DBH) within 30 days of site plan approval to determine additional tree mitigation cost.**
13. **75% of visibility density in the east and north buffers with no less than 6 foot in height**
14. **All lights on property shall be shielded from residents**
15. **There shall be no outdoor sound system**

Motion passed on a roll call vote, 3-1 with Ms. Arvidson dissenting and Mr. Dever abstaining.

COMMENTS OR STATEMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS BY STAFF

There was discussion among the Board members and staff about the upcoming special meeting / workshop on February 25, 2016

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:02pm.