



City of Pompano Beach
Planning and Zoning Board
(Virtual Meeting)

Commission Chambers
100 W. Atlantic Blvd.
Pompano Beach, FL
33060

Minutes

Wednesday, May 26, 2021

1:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

Fred Stacer
Joan Kovac
Tobi Aycock
Carla Coleman
Maria McLamore

Richard Klosiewicz was absent

Also in Attendance:

Mark Berman, City Attorney
James Saunders, Assistant City Attorney
Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney
Jennifer Gomez, Assistant Development Services Director
Jean Dolan, Principal Planner
Pamela McCleod, Planner
Matthew Edge, Planner
Lauren Gratzner, Planner
JR Anderson
Keith Beal
George Gentile
Paul Lambert

C. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Stacer announced that this past week Board member Willie Miller was in a fatal accident and thus has sadly passed away. Mr. Stacer stated he would like to send his condolences to Mr. Miller's family and asked Ms. Pamela McCleod to please forward upcoming services information to all Board members. He asked that in today's moment of silence, to please keep Mr. Miller and his contributions as a Board and community member in mind.

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Coleman stated starting on page 9, the end of the minutes seems to be missing. There are several areas after

“Paola West says the overall impact ...” don’t flow well or make sense. At the top of page 10 the word “public” is not spelled correctly among other issues. On page 12 there are several additional edits that need to be made including correcting reference to “Ms. Saunders”.

Mr. Stacer asked if there is anything else substantive. Ms. Coleman stated it seems words are missing and some areas are unclear. There is little clarity on the issue that talks about The Breakers and parking being shared. She stated postponing the minutes until they are edited.

Mr. Stacer asked Ms. McCleod to please forward a draft to Board members prior to the next meeting so that the Board can review ahead of time.

MOTION by Carla Coleman and seconded by Joan Kovac to postpone the minutes of the April 28, 2021 meeting to the next month’s meeting until corrections and edits have been made. All voted in favor.

E. INDIVIDUALS TESTIFYING PLACED UNDER OATH

Mr. Stacer explained that due to the virtual setting, individuals will be sworn in individually as opposed to in a large group setting by Pamela McCleod, Planner and Notary Public in the State of Florida.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. [LN-85](#) **R3 RESTAURANT MAJOR SITE PLAN AND MAJOR BUILDING DESIGN**

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Request: | Major Site Plan and Major Building Design |
| P&Z# | 20-12000050 |
| Owner: | City of Pompano Beach |
| Project Location: | 215-225 N. Pompano Beach Blvd. |
| Folio Number: | 484331010210 |
| Land Use Designation: | C (Commercial) |
| Zoning District: | PD-I/AOD (Planned Development-Infill/Atlantic Boulevard Overlay District) |
| Commission District: | 1 |
| Agent: | Anthony Cook (954-786-4664) |
| Project Planner: | Matt Edge |

Mr. Matthew Edge, Planner with the City, introduced himself to the Board and was sworn in by Pamela McCleod, Planner and Notary Public in the State of Florida. He stated the site plan in question is for the last remaining parcel for the pier redevelopment. The applicant is requesting Major Site Plan approval in order to construct a new restaurant with 6,714 square feet of interior space and 2,640 square feet of outdoor patio space. This site plan is a part of a larger master plan for the beach and pier, which includes a parking garage, retail, hotel, and restaurant space west of Pompano Beach Blvd, and between NE 3rd Street and NE 2nd Street. The original Master Plan adopted by the City Commission (Ordinance 2015-15) refers to this portion of the lot as “Parcel R3,” which is based off a labeling convention on a phasing plan submitted with the rezoning. The footprint of the proposed building and outdoor area is 9,354 square feet on a 181,574 square foot lot.

Mr. Edge stated that should the Board find that the application has provided competent, substantial evidence to satisfy the review standards for Major Site Plan approval, the Development Services Department recommends approval of the Major Site Plan subject to the following comments and conditions:

1. Provide parapets between 3-5 feet in height and cornices between 1-2 feet in depth.

2. Provide screening on all roof-mounted mechanical equipment on all sides at a height that meets or exceeds the height of the equipment.
3. Standard Conditions of Approval and/or Specifications required prior to Building Permit/ Zoning Compliance Permit issuance:
 - a. Include a copy of the approved CPTED plan, approved by the Broward Sheriff's Office.
 - b. Compliance with all applicable City Ordinances, including but not limited to comments issued by the Development Review Committee.
 - c. Substantial compliance with the plans, as submitted with this application.
4. Revise the Master Sign Program to include proposed sign types and locations for this building.
5. The proposed mural must be content-neutral and may not advertise the proposed business through images or copy unless proposed as signage (regulated by Ch. 156 Sign Code).

Mr. Edge showed the building rendering and stated he can answer any questions.

Mr. Stacer asked if the Board had any questions for staff.

Ms. Aycock stated there is a minor deviation letter in the backup and the way it is written, it is misleading. She stated that the 4th paragraph talks about the indoor vs. outdoor space and it sounds as if they are adding more when in actuality, they are asking for less than what was originally proposed.

Mr. Edge responded that this letter should not have been uploaded to the back up and should have come to staff first. Their proposal includes more outdoor space than they were allowed to have under the rezoning. Staff has found that the request meets the standards for the granting the minor deviation administratively, so it does not need to be brought up by this Board.

The following persons were granted access into the virtual meeting and placed under oath by Pamela McCleod, Planner and Notary Public in the State of Florida.

1. JR Anderson (3825 Edward Road, Suite 200, Cincinnati, OH)
2. Keith Beal (185 NE 4 Avenue, Suite 101, Delray Beach)

Mr. JR Anderson introduced himself to the Board. He stated they are the owners of the Beach House Restaurant and have been working with Tim Hernandez and his sublessee team. They have an arrangement to build this single-story restaurant, full-service breakfast, lunch, and dinner. The name of the restaurant will be "Borresco", as it will be more of a Mexican-themed restaurant. He said that they are proposing a full-service restaurant which will be a Spanish style. They will be providing some service to the hotel behind this location. He thanked the Board for the opportunity and stated they are happy with the venture. Mr. Stacer asked if tapas will be served or something more formal. Mr. Anderson responded the intention is to lower the price point from the Beach House's prices and be more approachable.

Mr. Keith Beal provided the Board with a presentation. He stated the first image is the view of the proposed building from Pompano Beach Boulevard and the hotel would be behind but is not pictured. The proposed restaurant will be constructed on Parcel R3 of the Pompano Beach Fishing Village Development. The site area is about 0.3 acres with the building area being 6,714 sq. ft. indoors and 2,957 sq. ft. of covered patio dining. Technical relief for column spacing and cross section on the patio was approved at the AAC on May 4th, 2021. The restaurant has the same ownership as the Beach House. He showed an overhead view of the site and building layout. He also showed elevations for the building and stated there would be a nice appearance as you approach the property. He added they have no objections to staff comments and those would be addressed during permitting. He closed with a summary of the building materials.

Ms. Kovac asked what the capacity is and how many people can be seated there.

Mr. Beal responded about 100 people can be seated in the patio and about 150 on the inside.

Mr. Stacer stated that he really likes the architecture. He also said that he saw a fire place. He asked if it is active.

Mr. Anderson responded yes, and it would most likely not be used in the summer.

Mr. Stacer asked if it was more part of the activity as opposed to the cooking.

Mr. Anderson responded yes, there is seating around it and they hope these seats would be preferred from October/November to March/April.

Mr. Stacer stated that they have had a lot of concern and input regarding how often the tractor trailers block traffic near the Beach House. A dedicated loading area would help. Mr. Anderson agreed.

Mr. Stacer asked if there were any questions from the Board or anyone wishing to speak. Ms. McCleod responded there was no one from the public present. Mr. Stacer closed the public hearing.

MOTION was made by Joan Kovac and seconded by Carla Coleman that the Board find that competent, substantial evidence has been presented for Major Site Plan #20-12000050 that satisfies the review standards and that the Board recommend approval, subject to the five conditions requested by staff. All voted in favor of the motion.

2. [LN-131](#) **POMPANO REALTY USA TEXT AMENDMENT**

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Request: | Text Amendment |
| P&Z# | 21-81000002 |
| Owner: | Pompano Realty USA, LLC |
| Project Location: | 277 S. Pompano Parkway |
| Folio Number: | 494204370050 |
| Land Use Designation: | C (Commercial) |
| Zoning District: | B-2 (Community Business) |
| Commission District: | 5 |
| Agent: | Nick Limner (954-415-5560) |
| Project Planner: | Lauren Gratzter (954-545-7792 / lauren.gratzter@copbfl.com) |

Ms. Lauren Gratzter and the following person was granted access into the virtual meeting and placed under oath by Pamela McCleod, Planner and Notary Public in the State of Florida.

1. George Gentile (1907 Commerce Ln #101, Jupiter)

Ms. Gratzter introduced herself to the Board. She stated that the Applicant, Nick Limner, is requesting to amend the zoning districts where a “Laundromat,” is permitted to include the B-2 zoning district. Concurrently, the Consolidated Use Table of the City’s Zoning Code (also known as Appendix A) will be updated to reflect the use as permitted in the B-2 zoning district. The Zoning Code currently permits by right a Laundromat in B-3 (General Business), B-4 (Heavy Business), and M-1 (Marine Business). Similar uses such as “Dry-Cleaning or Laundry Drop-Off Establishments” are currently permitted in the B-2 zoning districts. Permitting laundromats in the B-2 zoning district will be consistent with other uses permitted in this district. Additionally, laundromats are a compatible use to be located adjacent to residential areas. She showed a map of the city’s zoning districts, highlighting the B-2 zoning districts. The map also illustrates those areas zoned “B-2 – Community Business,” are generally between commercial and residential zoning districts. The text amendment was reviewed by the DRC on May 19, 2021 and no comments were made from the other departments. Staff does not object to the text amendment as presented.

Given the information provided to the Board, as the finder of fact, the Development Services Department provides the following recommendation, and alternative motions, which may be revised or modified at the Board's discretion.

Alternative Motion I

Recommend approval of the text amendment to the City Commission for their consideration.

Alternative Motion II

Table this application for additional information as requested by the Board.

Alternative Motion III

Recommend denial as the Board finds that the request is not consistent with the Future Land Use Goals, Objectives and Policies, or addressed the review standards for a code amendment as listed in this report.

Staff recommends Alternative Motion I.

Mr. Stacer asked if anyone had any questions of staff.

Ms. Coleman asked if staff took into consideration that laundromats open early, close late, and many times are open 24 hours, 7 days a week. She stated she was at odd with how that is a compatible use with the residential neighborhood next door.

Ms. Gratzner responded that laundromats are generally quiet locations despite their operating hours. She added that the use and times of operation will be providing a convenient service to the neighborhood. Ms. Kovac added she believed this would be a real service and said it needs to be located close to a residential neighborhood.

Mr. George Gentile introduced himself to the Board. He stated he represents the manager and operator of the Palm-Aire marketplace. He stated the facility proposing to be located here will not be a 24-hour operation. An ability to do some self-service laundry is very appropriate these days due to concerns with dropping off personal items as well as the pandemic. There will be employees at the location and the facility will be high-tech. Both drop off laundering and self-service options will be provided at the facility. The machines are run on mobile apps. He stated they have met all of the comprehensive plan and land development regulations and would appreciate the consideration.

Mr. Saunders added that the proposal is a text amendment that is applicable City-wide and cautioned the Board to consider that and not solely on the Palm-Aire location. Mr. Gentile agreed and added that the convenience would benefit other locations, not only this one. Ms. Gratzner confirmed the text amendment would be applicable City-wide and that the hours of operation can be restricted based on the zoning district should the Board wish to do so.

Ms. Coleman asked if the use is allowed by right, would it be better to make this a special use so that at that time the hours of operation can be restricted. She added her concern that if the use is allowed by right, the hours of operation cannot be restricted. Ms. Gratzner responded that they have restriction on hours of operation for other uses. There are different standards for each use in the code, whether permitted by right or not. She gave the examples of industrial uses that are permitted by right but require different buffers depending on the use.

Mr. Stacer added that some businesses are also limited in hours of operation under the business licensing standards. Mr. Saunders added his caution again and stated that the Board needs to be aware of the text amendment standards and not make their recommendation in a vacuum.

Mr. Stacer asked if anyone from the audience wanted to speak on the item. There was none. He closed the public hearing.

Mr. Stacer stated he was not concerned with the text amendment as he has considered the potential negative effects of the use to adjacent residential neighborhoods of B-2 zoned. He stated B-2 seems to be more on the outside perimeter of the residential areas and it gave him some level of comfort.

Ms. Coleman stated she was not comfortable with a business that can operate 24 hours a day next to any residential. She stated she understands the Palm-Aire location is not that, and patterns of development are changing that need this type of convenient service. However, she is not comfortable opening up the B-2 zoning to this type of 24-hour business, in many cases next to residential.

MOTION was made by Joan Kovac and seconded by Tobi Aycock that the Board finds that competent, substantial evidence has been presented for Text Amendment #21-81000002 that satisfies the review standards and that approval is recommended to the City Commission per Alternative Motion I. All voted in favor of the motion, except Carla Coleman.

3. [LN-135](#) **HOUSING TEXT AMENDMENT**

Request: Text Amendment
Project Planner: Jennifer Gomez (954-786-4640) /
 Jennifer.gomez@copbfl.com

Ms. Jennifer Gomez, Ms. Jean Dolan, Ms. Claudia McKenna, and Mr. Mark Berman as well as the following person was granted access into the virtual meeting.

Paul Lambert (1907 Commerce Ln #101, Jupiter, FL 33458)

Ms. Jennifer Gomez introduced herself to the Board and welcomed Ms. McLamore as the newest member. She introduced Mr. Berman, Ms. McKenna, Ms. Dolan, and Mr. Paul Lambert, the City's housing expert. She added there are several other city staff members involved with the project that are not present. She stated they will be providing the Board with the history and background on the housing amendments and get into the changes being recommended now. She provided the Board with a presentation. She reminded the Board that on January 26, 2021, the City passed a 4-month temporary moratorium on the processing of applications that would have the effect of allowing further concentration of subsidized affordable housing projects. The moratorium applied to new residential or mixed-use projects within ½ a mile of another existing subsidized housing project. The purpose of the moratorium was to allow time to study, hold public hearings, and prepare text amendments. All residential and/or mixed-use developments with approved Development Orders or active DRC comments were considered automatically vested and not subject to the moratorium. Today marks the end of the 4-month moratorium. The intent of this public hearing is to establish "Zoning in Progress" consistent with the standards of section 155.2309. This means applications in conflict with the text amendments would be placed on hold. She continued to provide some background. The U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development found that the deconcentration of poverty is a central poverty fighting tool. In the City of Pompano Beach "Affordable Housing Study Summary Findings" report, dated May 17, 2017 and conducted by Paul Lambert, a concern raised included that "a large portion of LIHTC units is being developed in census tracts where there is already a concentration of existing rent restricted or subsidized units; and the concentration of low-income families has a very real impact on families and neighborhoods." The study emphasized that policies which promote the production of rent restricted affordable housing must do so in a way which concurrently encourages deconcentration of that housing. The Florida Housing Finance Corporation requires ½ mile separation between Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects in Broward County. Late last year, the City's Comprehensive Plan was updated. The Housing Element included deconcentration of poverty as a central theme. Policies 03.03.02 and 03.03.03 both deal with distance separation requirements. She stated that following that work, the moratorium was adopted and staff examined what they can do within the zoning code to create zoning standards that implement this policy recommendation. Before that can be done, the Housing Study needed to be updated as it was written in 2017. Mr. Paul Lambert has updated the Housing Study and provided recommendations for

the mixed-income text amendments.

City staff and Mr. Paul Lambert were placed under oath by Pamela McCleod, Planner and Notary Public in the State of Florida.

Mr. Lambert introduced himself to the Board. He stated he has been working with the city since 2017. He would like to provide some context for the Board. He stated that both the 2017 and 2021 updated study were very indicative that there is an affordable housing crisis within Broward County. The level of demand for affordable units at the income level of having to pay 30% or less in best case scenario and 50% or less in worst case scenario has increased significantly. The single-family home and townhome price has gone up 30-40% from 2017-2021. This has locked down the housing market to an extent. He stated there are 3 major programs for providing long term affordability, primarily through rent restriction. This includes the public housing program, the Section 8 tenant-based voucher program, and the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program. He showed a map showing the concentration of income-restricted developments in Broward County. Income-restricted units are heavily concentrated in a limited number of cities and neighborhoods. There are 10 of 31 municipalities that have no income-restricted units and an additional 9 only have one development. Over 60% of the municipalities in the county have 1 or less income restricted development. 10 municipalities with 0 income-restricted units make up 17% of the County's developable land area. Including municipalities with only one income restricted development, the municipalities in sum make up nearly 50 percent of the county's urbanized developable land area. The lack of development of income restricted units in many communities is not a result of a lack of land, rather it is a result of a lack of sites which are zoned and priced accordingly. Concentration of low-income families have significant consequences for children in those families. In 2015, two studies were done that concluded children of low-income families who grow up in middle income neighborhoods perform significantly better in earnings as adults than their low-income peers who grow up in low-income neighborhoods. The standard for what constitutes a high poverty area varies but HUD has generally used a census tract, which has a poverty rate above 20% as being an area of high poverty. The concentration of income restricted units, particularly when there is an associated racial or ethnic concentration, runs counter to the objectives of the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule. This rule was watered down in 2018 and then rescinded by the Trump Administration right before the 2020 election to serve an election specific political purpose; however, all indicators are that the current administration will re-promulgate the rule in the near future. The rule called for government at every level to implement deconcentration of poverty efforts to the extent that the racial makeup of poverty is relatively homogenous. Pompano Beach is already doing its part by encouraging, though the maximum extent possible under state law, inclusion of affordable units in developments built within affluent neighborhoods. With the amendments, the City will also be doing its part by proposing policies that more than double existing affordable housing bonus prices in the zoning code, which will be targeted to develop rent restricted rental housing on non-impacted neighborhoods of the City, as well as require the inclusion of non-income restricted units in new principally income restricted developments. This will encourage a mix of income units over time.

Ms. Gomez stated that while existing requirements for affordable housing are in place within the zoning code and are being modified in some way, the primary text change being proposed is for areas within ½ mile from existing subsidized housing projects. She showed a map identifying existing tax credit and subsidized housing projects with a ½ mile radius. These are the areas where this code amendment would apply. Key terms that will be used include "Income Restricted Units", which are restricted through an agreement, deed, or regulation of being rented or sold to families who have incomes below 80% of the median income, "Non-Income Restricted Units", units that are not restricted to certain income levels and can be rented or sold at prices based on what the unrestricted private market will bear, and "One-Half Mile Radius", the ½-mile radius separating Income Restricted Housing from each other. The proposed zoning requirements include the addition of a standards that requires all new residential and mixed-use development projects with a residential component greater than 50 units within ½-mile radius of an income restricted housing development must include a minimum of 30% Non-Income Restricted Units. Incentives include allowances of up to a 50% zoning density bonus as well as minor variations or adjustments to certain dimensional or numerical standards of the code based on specific criteria. The proposed flex requirements will also require meeting the 30% Non-Income Restricted Units. In all other areas all projects must include 15% affordable housing or pay into the Local Affordable Housing Trust Fund for every unit not classified affordable. In-Lieu of Fees are being modified to provide developers with the option

of paying into the fund \$6,055 per unit, which is a \$3,722 increase from the existing \$2,333.

Ms. Jean Dolan introduced herself to the Board. She mentioned that the policies that were presented in March are now effective. Policy 2.16.3 allows additional density in residential land use categories for provision of affordable housing up to 50% of land use density or 100% of land use density if providing very low- and low-income units. If a project provides 5% very low-income units, the project gets 19 bonus units for every low-income unit. The density bonuses also apply in the commercial land use categories, so long as a similar mix is provided. Prior to this, flex units would have been required. She showed the County map of eligible roads and land use areas and the City map of the same for comparison. The County's map shows more "commerce" because they included industrial, which staff does not consider appropriate. The City's map excludes industrial areas. The County also missed some roadways, which the City would like included. The next steps include this hearing, which establishes "Zoning in Progress", additional outreach prior to submitting to the County to amend the density maps, then City Commission first and second reading. If anything changes before Commission first reading, staff is happy to bring the changes back to the Board if necessary.

Mr. Stacer asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Saunders asked based on the comments made by Ms. Dolan concerning outreach, is there a thought to change the text amendment after outreach, and is staff anticipating any changes as a result of the outreach. Ms. Gomez responded that it will be a judgement call based on what comes out of the outreach. If anything is changed significantly, changes will be brought back to the Board. Mr. Saunders stated he recommends giving staff some latitude to be able to address non-substantive issues.

Mr. Mark Berman stated that because of the short timing of the moratorium, they wanted to make it as short a moratorium as possible to avoid the perception of being anti-low-income housing. This now gives the city the opportunity to do the outreach that is usually done for a longer moratorium. This in no way should be considered as a discriminatory action taken by the City. This is an opportunity to try and provide more mixed-income housing units and deconcentrating poverty by encouraging income mixing. The city is not prohibiting development from happening within 1/2-mile radius of another income-related project. They are giving the developers incentives to build and discourage the concentration of poverty. The city is trying to encourage market-rate units within affordable housing projects.

Ms. Coleman congratulated anyone who has brought this item to the Board today. She stated this is an outstanding effort to deal with a problem that needs to be dealt with. She asked Ms. Dolan if a developer wanted to develop within the half mile, the developer would have to do the 30% and not buy out of it.

Ms. Dolan responded that is correct. Ms. Dolan stated to use the County's policy outside of the radius areas, the buyout for the affordable housing is a pricey \$42,000+ a unit. It is trying to encourage the building of the units.

Ms. Coleman asked Mr. Lambert to explain the 40% shown on the slide with the graph. Mr. Lambert responded that the percent is the income restriction of 4.0%, not 40%. This is the total percentage of income-restricted housing in the City. Ms. Coleman thanked him for the clarification.

Ms. Kovac asked Mr. Lambert what experience he has had attracting renters or purchasers to non-income-restricted units within predominantly income-restricted buildings. Mr. Lambert responded around the state the trend is requiring income restricted units within public housing. At the outset, the profile of the family that is lives in income-restricted units compared to non-income-restricted units is not very different. Over time as the neighborhoods transform. This is something that will not happen overnight but it allows it overtime to have a true mix of incomes.

Mr. Stacer asked what does it mean to allow up to 50% bonuses and does it have to do with the percentage of the non-income restrictions. Ms. Gomez responded that it is a 50% zoning bonus that can be taken advantage of based on the development standards in the area. Mr. Stacer asked if you hit the threshold, do you automatically get the bonus. Ms. Gomez responded yes; they would get the zoning bonus; but they would also have to meet the requirements of the County.

Mr. Stacer addressed Mr. Lambert. He stated on page 45, Figure 20, he noticed that the City went from 34.8% in 2005 renter occupancy to 46.8% in 2018, a 12% increase. This is a significant increase. He asked if Mr. Lambert has a comment about what this represents and if this means ownership is going down. Mr. Lambert responded that the data comes from the American Community Survey of the Census, which is different from the long form that was used in 2007 and prior, decennially. For example, the 2014 data is from the full 5 years prior. He mentioned there were a lot of foreclosures during that time with the economic downturn, which may be the reason the data shows the way it does. He stated he would review the data.

Mr. Stacer noted that the number of people per household went from 2.45 to 2.7, which is a 10% increase from 14-18 years. He asked what that was a result from.

Mr. Lambert responded that it could be one of two things. The first may be the nature of the housing market as time goes on with older residents on the beach passing on and the new owners are younger. The second may be that the number of Hispanic households have grown in the City, up to 22%. These are typically larger families. Mr. Stacer thanked him and stated this does not affect his opinion.

Mr. Stacer stated that in figure 21, page 46, it says that single family households in 2005 was 16,000 and in 2018 it was 14,300. This is a difference of 1,700 single-family houses. He asked how that was possible. Ms. Dolan interjected and stated that staff noticed the census data was off. They put several caveats on the data that staff was forced to use from the State. The data looked obviously wrong. Mr. Stacer thanked Ms. Dolan and said he felt better.

Mr. Stacer asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak on this item. There was none.

Mr. Saunders interjected to remind the Board that the motion should include the ability for staff to make non-substantive changes that are necessary.

MOTION was made by Joan Kovac and seconded by Carla Coleman that the Board recommend approval of the text amendments, and the allowance for staff to make non-substantive changes that may be necessary, to the City Commission. All voted in favor of the motion.

A. AUDIENCE TO BE HEARD

There was no audience to be heard.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. REPORTS BY STAFF

Ms. McCleod reminded the Board that staff will now be scheduling in-person meetings. The next Planning & Zoning Board meeting will be on June 23rd, at 6:00pm unless the Board would like to suggest otherwise. Ms. McLamore stated she prefers the 6pm time. The Board agreed to keep the 6pm time.

Ms. Gomez stated the CIP meeting is scheduled next month. Ms. McCleod stated it is scheduled for next month's meeting. That changes the time for the June 23rd Planning and Zoning Board meeting to 5pm to start with the CIP item. Mr. Stacer asked Ms. McLamore if she can make an exception for next month as this is only presented once a year. Ms. McLamore responded yes. Ms. McCleod stated she would send out a reminder email before sending the backup.

2. BOARD MEMBERS DISCUSSION

Ms. Kovac stated she would miss the Zoom meetings though she found them challenging at the beginning. Ms. Coleman welcomed Ms. McLamore to the Board. Ms. McLamore thanked the Board for the welcome. Ms. Aycock stated she looked forward to seeing everyone in person. Mr. Stacer stated the news of Mr. Miller's passing was a shock.

and mentioned what a wonderful person he was. He was sorry to hear it. He stated the viewing is on Friday night and the service is on Saturday morning at 11am.

Mr. Stacer asked Ms. Gomez when the overlay district for Dixie Highway will be discussed. Ms. Gomez responded that Max Wemyss, Planner, has been working on this. She stated about a week and a half to two weeks from today they would be meeting with Mr. Stacer to go over the item. About a month and a half after that, they should have something to bring to the Board. Mr. Stacer stated he would prefer the name of the overlay should not include the name "Dixie" in it.

Mr. Stacer stated he noticed the City made almost \$30 million last month in permitting. He stated this says a lot of staff and the city combined. Ms. Dolan added that the city has a 45% greenhouse gas reduction goal. She stated staff is looking at this as they reopen and create policies for reopening. The transportation sector is the greatest greenhouse gas generator. Development Services, particularly Planning and Zoning is looking at a hybrid workforce model so that this strategy is used to reach that 45% reduction goal.

Ms. Coleman asked if City Hall is reopening as well. Ms. Dolan stated June 14th is the official unlocking date. June 8th is an in-person City Commission meeting.

I. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: Any person who decides to appeal any decision of this BOARD/COMMITTEE with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to insure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

DocuSigned by:

A7709CDFAFBC46B...
Fred Stacer, Chair