

**MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
April 12, 2022 5:30PM**

The City of Lake Wales Planning and Zoning Board held a meeting on April 12 at 5:30 p.m. in the Commission Chambers at City Hall, 201 W. Central Ave. Lake Wales Florida.

ATTENDANCE

Planning Board Members (Shaded area indicates absence):

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice- Chairman Charlene Bennett	John Gravel	Casey McKibben	Eric Rio	Kyra Love
-----------------------------------	--	----------------	-------------------	----------	-----------

City Staff:

Dept. of Planning and Development
Mark J. Bennett – Director of Development Services
Autumn Cochella – Development Services Manager
Jasmine Khammany – Senior Planner
Shena Rowland – Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER – Mr. Lutton called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL – Ms. Bennett was not present.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Meeting–March 22, 2022
Ms. Loves makes a motion to approve with two typo corrections. Mr. Gravel seconds.
Minutes approved unanimously by voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – Mr. Lutton reads the following:
Public participation from residents, taxpayers, business owners and utility customers is encouraged. The Planning and Zoning Board welcomes information that would assist them in considering agenda items, City Business and otherwise fulfilling the City’s mission to make Lake Wales “a bit better or more beautiful” for its citizens. Anyone wishing to speak should give their name, state if they are inside or outside the city limits and they will have 5 minutes. Courtesy and respect is the hallmark. Speakers are not expected to address the Board and audience members and not engage in back and forth discussion that can deteriorate into argument, debate and accusations. Questions about subject matter are best directed to city staff during normal business hours.

He then opens the Communications and Petitions portion of the hearing and asks if anyone has anything to bring up to the Planning and Zoning Board? He further states if you have a comment or question regarding a specific line item then you wait for that line item to be heard and there will be a time for public communication and petition.

Audience member approaches the podium to ask if there is any way to turn up the volume on the microphones. Mr. Lutton responds that there is no way to turn up the volume. Audience member then asks if the board can speak louder to accommodate and takes his seat.

Mr. Lutton then calls for any further communication and in seeing no one else approach, he closes the Communications and Petitions and calls for New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Forest Lakes – Planned Development Project

Review Staff report by Jasmine Khammany
Begin Report:

PROJECT:	Forest Lakes
APPLICANT:	Charles Millar
APPROVAL:	Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval / Special Exception Use Permit Approval for a Residential Planned Development Project
PUBLIC HEARING:	Requirements have been met.

Jasmine Khammany begins the presentation of the staff report.

Mr. Lutton interrupts the presentation to ask where the proposed buffer will be located.

Ms. Khammany responds it is on Chalet Suzanne.

Mr. Lutton asks if there is a picture to present?

Ms. Khammany responds by showing which one it is and states the applicant is proposing trees that would suffice with the overhead utilities and plants that are susceptible to the wetlands conditions. She then continues with her presentation.

Ms. Khammany concludes her presentation and informs the Board that the applicant is present and has brief presentation.

Mr. Charles Millar introduces himself and makes his presentation.

Ms. Love asks where proposed water features with the fountains will go?

Ms. Millar responds that inside the water features there will be water fountains. He further explains there is a boardwalk that runs west of where the cabana and pool are located, it will walk out into the water and the fountains will be on either side.

Ms. Love asks when he refers to water, does he mean the wetlands?

Mr. Millar responds not the wetlands but the bodies they create for drainage will have these features. Mr. Millar then pulls up slides to further explain the locations.

Mr. Lutton asks where the clubhouse is located.

Mr. Millar then responds by visually showing him on the slide.

Ms. Love asks about a portion of the property located at the top of her plans that she is showing as open space/wetlands.

Mr. Millar responds that is indeed a wetland area that they will have to avoid. He further states they may have to shift just a hair to stay out of it.

Mr. Lutton then asks about the railroad right of way.

Mr. Millar responds that he would love to use this part of the property but cannot. He states there are restrictions there and an easement. He further states that because of the dirt it would be difficult to develop or plant anything. He claims it will be part of the open space.

Mr. Lutton asks about another piece of the property on the plans.

Mr. Millar states that is about 1.6 acres it was part of the purchase of sale agreement. He then gives Staff credit for knowing this part needed to be annexed into the City. It is going to be open space and is actually one of the conditions that it remain open space. It is going to be a pocket park.

Mr. Lutton asks if storm water is going to drain to a certain area he points to on the plans.

Mr. Millar states it will. He further states they are in the process of obtaining their ERP permit. He further states he has four staff members working on this. He claims they will improve on the drainage in this area.

Mr. Lutton understands this and wanted to clarify for the general public where the drainage is going.

Mr. Lutton then apologizes for the questions but states it is due to the size of the plans he is reading.

Ms. Cochella apologizes and states in the future it will be 24 x 36 plans.

Ms. Lutton asks about a road on the plans, and asks if it will connect to another property.

Mr. Millar states no it will not.

Mr. Millar informs the board that he has a member from KB homes present for any questions as well.

Mr. Lutton then opens the floor for public hearing and asks the audience if anyone wants to speak on this project? In seeing no one he closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board for discussion.

Mr. Lutton asks if the townhomes will have garages.

Mr. Millar states they will.

Mr. Lutton states the 25 ft set back requirement for garages will not work on the townhomes.

Ms. Khammany responds it was not intended for that and there are parking spaces located around the townhomes to make up for that. She then refers to the client.

Steve Feccia from KB Homes introduces himself and then responds there will be two car garages and two spaces in the driveway plus additional street parking.

Mr. Lutton states some of the houses are only 30 ft wide.

Mr. Feccia states the driveways are 16 ft. for the townhomes.

Mr. Lutton states in doing the math you only have 10 ft left for an entrance door.

Mr. Feccia states they will provide renderings for City Council.

Mr. Lutton states it will be needed as they do not get as technical.

Mr. Millar informs the Board the projection/recession of the garage was discussed based off the non-monotony standards.

Mr. Lutton understands they are not going to be row house townhomes. He confirms you are not going to be able to recess the garage. The freestanding homes want to have the garage set back but cannot do that on the townhomes.

Mr. Feccia states they will be set back to some degree. It is not a flat façade. He states again he will have renderings for City Council.

Mr. Lutton feels this should be changed.

Mr. Bennett states the condition is intended for Single Family.

Mr. Lutton states he does not want to ham hock them for no reason.

Mr. Lutton asks what will be going into the Commercial area. He is concerned about parking.

Mr. Feccia states they are not a commercial developer. They will get the site stabilized and ready but is unsure as to who it will sell to. It will be low intensity use with a restricted deed.

Mr. Lutton asks if it will be more office vs retail.

Mr. Feccia states he is unsure.

Mr. Lutton asks based on past experience?

Mr. Feccia states it has been more office.

Mr. Gravel mentions the question and answer session with Carlsburg. He states that when they did the Future Land Use and Zoning there were quite a few County residents that had concerns. He states one of the concerns was traffic. He recognizes the site has two entrances, one off of Chalet Suzanne and one off of Hickory Hammock. He states the concerns were mainly off of Hickory Hammock road. He asks if any provision were made?

Mr. Millar states that the traffic methodology has been approved by the County and they will abide by the recommendations made by the County. He is not anticipated a light but suspects there may be potential improvements for a turn lane which will be an Eastbound turn lane from Chalet Suzanne into the site. He further states unless the County comes up with further recommendations then that is the only improvement that has been discussed.

Mr. Feccia further states that he knows that there are concerns on the second entrance which is Hickory Hammock. He will have a study ready for City Council that will show the volume of traffic entering and exiting each entrance.

Mr. Gravel stated the people that spoke before were majorly concerned with the traffic up and down Hickory Hammock because a lot of them access their properties from Nursery Road and Hickory Hammock.

Mr. Feccia states that their studies show that most of the traffic will come from 27 and Chalet Suzanne Road. They will provide graphics to show that better.

Mr. Lutton remembers another concern being flooding that they are currently experiencing. That is why he wanted to make a point of where the retention pond is and that the storm water is heading in that direction versus down south or to the east of the property.

Mr. Feccia further elaborates the topography of the site showing the pond where it is now. He points out the pond is actually oversized for any compensatory storage.

Mr. Lutton asks if they will have to bring in any fill to raise the building pads?

Mr. Feccia states they have not done final grading yet but most likely.

Mr. Millar states hopefully not.

Mr. Lutton asks if the pond is there now?

Mr. Feccia states it is not and they will pull what they can from the pond and the goal is to minimize the import. They do not want miles of truck traffic for weeks on end.

Mr. Lutton states that is just business. It will be gone and no one will remember the truck traffic. The goal is to get the building sites so it does not drain on the neighboring property. That is one of the areas of major concern. He elaborates that the Board knows you cannot do that but the general public does not know. He states that is why he is really pushing this for the record. He asks if anyone has any further questions.

Ms. Love has a question for Staff. She asks if the buffer that the horticulturist is recommending is only along Chalet Suzanne?

Ms. Khammany responds it is only along Chalet Suzanne where the wetlands are.

Ms. Love asks about the other buffers that are around the wetlands?

Ms. Khammany responds that is what the actual landscape plan will reflect and the horticulturist will review.

Ms. Love asks why they are only recommended something specifically along Chalet Suzanne and not the other spots?

Ms. Khammany responds the applicant was proposing buffering around the perimeter and streets so far.

Ms. Love understands that Staff just revised the proposed plan.

Ms. Khammany states they have concerns about buffers because of the overhead lines so Staff has reached out to the horticulturist for options because the applicant does see the need for buffering along the roadway from the wetland area.

Ms. Love asks for confirmation on the possibility that the other buffers will come into play once the actual landscape plan is completed.

Ms. Khammany confirms this.

Ms. Love asks the applicant for clarification on the acreage of the recreation area, the presentation reflects .8 and the staff report reflects 1.39. She asks where the other recreation area is located?

Mr. Feccia responds that the .8 acres is where the pool cabana will be located. The rest of it is open space and trails. They will have a tot lot, gazebo, items of that nature.

Ms. Love asks if they have counted open space twice?

Ms. Cochella responds that what they have done is broken it down as to what is going to be in a specific amenity package. They are providing overall 1.39 acres. The .8 speaks to the cabana. The recreation does count towards open space.

Mr. Lutton asks if they forgot to put in a rear set backs?

Ms. Khammany states the rear set back is 15 ft and it meets the minimum requirements.

Mr. Rio asks if they have done the 5 ft set backs on other projects?

Mr. Lutton states on all of them, that is why they keep moving the ac equipment to the back.

Mr. Lutton asks Mr. Bennet about the que for water and sewer. On a project of this size, would they need to but the entire 295 units on reserve to get the site development permit? He is assuming they are going to develop the entire site at one time and not phase it?

Mr. Bennett responds that would be a good assumption but then asks the applicant to verify if they are phasing?

Mr. Feccia responds they are phasing this project.

Mr. Bennett then asks if they are doing site development for the entire project or by the phase?

Mr. Feccia states they will do site development for the entire project. They will mass grade and put roughly 100 lots in the ground for the first phase.

Mr. Bennett then clarifies that Mr. Lutton's question is what are they getting the que agreement for?

Mr. Lutton confirms that is the question.

Mr. Bennett responds he does not know. His initial thought would be whatever is approved for site development permit for phasing. He further explains if they come in with a phase of 100 then that will be the que agreement or they can do a que agreement for the entire project.

Mr. Lutton comments they would need to come up with more cash. The reason for the question is if all of the other projects want to do phasing, the City will get in a bind where one project may get their second phase in before another project and they run out of que. He feels this is something that needs to be brought before the City Manager for a game plan. His concern is running out of availability.

Mr. Bennett then reminds the Board that some projects that are transferring well capacity will go to the front of the line because they are bringing water to the table so to speak.

Mr. Lutton reminds the Board that years ago sewer was a problem. He is not what current capacity is on sewer.

Mr. Bennett replies the concern is water.

Mr. Lutton then asks for further questions and in seeing none will entertain a motion.

Mr. Gravel makes a motion to approve the recommendation to City Council for PDP as stated in the staff report.

Ms. Cochella then asks for confirmation on opening the public hearing.

There is open discussion and is confirmed that a public hearing was conducted.

Mr. Bennett asks for clarification on the condition of set backs for the 25 ft on the garages is just for the single family homes and not the towhhomes.

Mr. Gravel clarifies this.

Mr. Lutton asks for a second.

Ms. Love seconds the motion.

Mr. Lutton calls for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton Yes	Vice- Chairman Charlene Bennett	John Gravel Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio Yes	Kyra Love Yes
--	--	-----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	------------------

Mr. Lutton states the Recommendation to City Commission is approved.

6. Jewel Ridge – Planned Development Project

COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – No Public in Attendance

Review Staff report by Jasmine Khammany
Begin Report:

PROJECT: Jewel Ridge
APPLICANT: Shelton Rice
APPROVAL: Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval / Special Exception Use Permit Approval for a Residential Planned Development Project
PUBLIC HEARING: Requirements have been met.

Ms. Khammany presents the staff report and informs the Board that the applicant has a presentation.

Mr. Shelton Rice introduces himself and his Staff to the Board and begins his presentation.

Mr. Lutton then opens the public hearing and in seeing no one he closes the hearing he brings it back to the Board for questions and comments.

Ms. Love asks if there is a reason the two waivers did not make it in. She feels this is a significant difference and asks for clarification if it is meant for every lot?

Mr. Rice responds the minimum home size is for every lot. The 1100 square feet was originally included in the submittal package. He explains there was a resubmittal that did not include the list of waivers and he feels it was lost in the shuffle. He further states that Staff can comment if they are in support of these waivers.

Ms. Cochella states she is looking at it thoughtfully because Staff had not contemplated a 72 percent maximum lot coverage at this point. She thinks they have done 70 percent in Lake Ashton. For the record, she is hesitating because she is contemplating this request. She asks if this is to provide for homebuyers to put in a pool or a shed or other types of things? She explains that the City of Lake Wales code is different from other City Codes in that other code considers your impervious surface or your lot coverage to be just the house. The City of Lake Wales code includes driveways, pools, sheds, etc so she can see where they are coming from.

Andrew Island from Lang Engineering introduces himself and states they may be over representing based on what the code does and does not include. He explains that at 72 percent they are contemplating the full maximum area you would ever see of driveway, the footprint of the house and a very generous pool and hardscape package. He understands he may have exceeding the percentage of what Staff is used to seeing in the way Lake Wales code defines coverage. He states the request given is a request in asking for 72 percent is a true maximum impervious surface coverage. He states he will need to fine tune that to match the way Lake Wales code is set up. He does not feel they are asking for anything out of the ordinary.

Mr. Bennett asks what is the rationale for 1100 square ft homes versus 1500 square ft homes?

Mr. Island responds that due to the fact of not knowing the end home builder they are trying to ensure flexibility to contemplate a variety of homebuilders.

Mr. Rice addresses Mr. Bennet in saying that in requesting 1100 square ft minimum home size, they are talking about a variety of different homes in this area. They are comparing to townhomes which is likely going to be a little smaller product than the single family homes that has been seen. He further explains they are talking about 40 ft wide lots in many of the communities around them, they have 50 ft wide lots as well as 62 ft wide lots. They are not saying it would be 1100 square ft across the board. This is simply to give flexibility to provide lot sizes consistent with what the market demand is for the area.

Ms. Love asks for clarification on the fact that they are looking at single family homes, would it not need to be presented for approval if it were townhomes?

Mr. Rice clarifies they are not proposing townhomes. He elaborates that two surrounding developments, Hunt Club Brothers North and South have townhome products included in their project. His point is developments around them are doing units smaller than the 1100 square ft. They do not know who the end buyer is so they want to be able to provide a mixture and that is why they are asking for flexibility.

Ms. Love mentions that she appreciates seeing the parks. She states she is not comfortable with 72 percent, she would feel better with 60 percent. She further states she does not want to change the square footage from 1500. She feels that if you are buying townhome then you are buying a townhome. If you are buying house then you want a house.

Mr. Bennett states that if a future builder wanted to come in and build townhomes he would need to come back before the board and ask for a modification on the PDP.

Ms. Love agrees with this.

Mr. Gravel asks if that is living area they are referring to?

Mr. Rice confirms it is.

Mr. Lutton asks about the depths of the lots? It is not stated on the plan.

Mr. Island answers the typical lot depth is 110 feet.

Mr. Lutton responds that the math is not working. If you are going to put a 1500 square ft or an 1100 square ft home with a 10 ft rear set back and 72 percent or even 60 percent maximum lot coverage, it isn't adding up. He does not know why the rear set backs need to be reduced so far. He feels it will effect the back area. He understands some of the lots back up to a park so it will not matter.

Ms. Love asks if he is referring to the rear set back?

Mr. Lutton clarifies, it is the rear set back. He states it should be 20 ft per the code.

Ms. Love corrects it is 15 ft per the code.

Mr. Lutton concedes it is 15ft per the code. He does not understand why the extra 5 ft is needed.

Mr. Island responds that he works on projects thru out Central Florida and in the middle of the market across central Florida, the lot depth that developers want is 120 ft. There are some that would like to see a lot more. On the small end they commonly see 110 ft. He further elaborates that due to construction costs being on the rise. Their construction costs are exceeding \$120 per square ft on the vertical construction and there are buyers that are interested in smaller square footage product. That is why they are requesting the 1100 square ft. He then elaborates on the minimum rear yard dimension, because the depth is 110 ft, the home builders have a variety of products so they are wanting as much flexibility as possible.

Mr. Rice states that in hearing concerns from Planning and Zoning Board and in talking with his clients, he explains they are trying to preserve as many options as possible for future buyers. They do not want to exclude a future buyer because they have created something that is too limited for them. They are trying to add in more flexibility than you may typically see with a project that has a builder tied into it. In light of this, they feel they can work with a minimum home size of 1200 square ft, that does not exclude any builders. They are not expecting that is where this will go and does not want the focus of the conversation to be a certain number of homes tied to a certain square footage, ie, 172 homes at 1200 square ft. This is a minimum they are trying to establish and the applicant is willing to concede to 1200 square ft. if that appeases some concerns of the Board. He further states the code requirement of 40 percent maximum lot coverage is frankly archaic with the lot widths that are contemplated in the market today. He explains it appears to be a big deviation and it is when aligned with the code but the code is not aligned with any of the developments in Polk County.

Mr. Lutton states the previous project they reviewed has 55 ft lots with 1500 square foot homes and the smaller townhomes were at 1200 square ft.

Ms. Love asks if staff can explain the waivers of strict compliance relating to the access road (the remainder of the request was indiscernible).

Ms. Cochella states it is technical issues in the code and refers to the engineer.

Mr. Island states it may be helpful to set the tone of the conversation if the City can articulate the reasoning behind the minimum in the code.

Ms. Cochella states it pertains to emergency apparatus and what they have asked for has already been reviewed and approved by the DRC Committee. The DRC reviews for this reason.

Ms. Love then asks about the curve radius.

Mr. Island states they call that the eyebrow. He explains the curve radius they asked for in the waiver is to go to 60 ft from the standard 100 ft. He points out the dash line which is the center line.

There is open discussion as to the location.

Mr. Island explains this is a typical radius. It is normally 50/50 if a jurisdiction needs a waiver. He feels as a road designer it is a more appropriate radius. He has spent a lot of time on this product type and is routinely forced to build roads that are too wide and too gently curved in order to encourage low speeds. This reduced radius will encourage this slower speed. He then elaborates on the need for these types of radius.

Ms. Cochella states the reduced entrance road is the same thing, how far do you drive before you make your first turn, again, it was approved by the DRC. It is another safety component in the code.

Mr. Lutton asks if this road lines up with the Hunt Club Road, Hamlin?

There is open discussion regarding Hamlin Street.

Mr. Lutton then confirms it does not.

Ms. Love then states Hamlin is not paved yet.

Mr. Bennett states the Board has not seen the plans for Hunt Club South as of yet. The idea for Hamlin was to have more ways to get around Hunt Club North and to have Jewel Ridge to tie into Hamlin and have more ways for traffic to go North and then eventually East. You can see Hamlin aligns with the entrance to Hunt Club. Hunt Club South residents can go straight up Hamlin or make a left and go to 11th or go to the right go to Hunt Brothers.

Ms. Love asks if they will pave Post Salter.

Mr. Bennett responds that they will be responsible for improvements on Post Salter. He states the whole idea is to not have all of the traffic go on 11th. He then opines on the 1100 square ft. request. He states that Staff has never recommended a reduction in the living area, They have normally gone with what code required.

Mr. McKibben asks when the Code was last modified.

Ms. Cochella responds it was before her time. She further states that 1500 is the maximum square ft you are required to build.

Mr. Bennett states one course of action is to stick with the 1500. If the Board wants to consider the 1100, one option would be to require a mandatory two car garage which is typically 400 square ft, This way, you have the illusion of a larger home. It is a technique that is used. He will leave it at the Boards discretion.

Mr. Gravel asks if you keep it at 1500 square ft, and a builder does come in wanting smaller they can always ask for variances.

Mr. Bennett states they can come back to the Board and ask for a modification of the PDP for smaller living areas.

Mr. Gravel states if they had a builder here that was developing the project they could have an opinion. He is inclined to keep it at 1500 and see what the future Builder may want to do.

Mr. Bennett feels everyone is in agreeance that more than 40 percent is needed. He asks what is the magic number, 60 percent, 65 percent? He does not think they have ever entertained 72 percent.

Ms. Love thinks the normal is 60 percent. It is the most she has ever approved.

Ms. Cochella states she is comfortable with 65 percent it is comparable to what the Board has been approving. She speaks to the reduction in the home size. She feels if they are reducing the lot size, reducing the set backs, then increasing the impervious, it lends itself to some relief for the housing size. She does see how that is appropriate. She would not be comfortable going lower than 1200 square ft. which is standard for the single family residential.

Mr. Rio asks if they approve lower can they limit how many homes can be built at that size?

Ms. Cochella confirms you can limit it to a percentage.

Mr. Lutton states another option is to make three different building sets with three different lots. For example, 1100 for the 47ft, 1300 for the 52 and 1500 for the 62.

There is open discussion on this suggestion.

Mr. Rice offers another option of 1200 for 47ft, 1350 for the 52 ft and 1500 for the 62 ft. In talking with his clients, he feels this option would be best.

Mr. Bennett states he does not like doing site design at the dais. He concedes this option does make sense but again, does not like doing site design at the dais.

Mr. Lutton asks if they have a builder in mind.

Mr. Jonathan Shredny introduces himself to the Board. He is based out of South Florida, Miami, Ft. Lauderdale area. His grandfather who has passed, acquired this property and handed it down to him. He further states they are developers, Bob (unintelligible last name), is one of the families engineers and has worked for them for over 20 years. They have developed industrial, class A distribution, box warehousing, office and multi-family projects in South Florida. He explains they are not single home buyers. They are envisioning this a joint venture with a single family builder. He does not want to build micro units but wants the flexibility. He thinks it would be advantageous to present it in this matter.

Mr. Gravel asks about his grandfather.

Mr. Shredny replies he was in the steel business. He purchased this in 2004. He then gives a history on his family and projects.

Mr. Lutton thanks him.

Ms. Love asks for direction from the Board.

Mr. Lutton responds that they should give a little play with the potential builders and having the tiered approach sounds reasonable for the City as a whole. He states to be honest, these lots are fairly large compared to other projects.

Ms. Love asks if they should tier the maximum lot coverage or do a straight 60 percent?

Mr. Lutton replies straight lot coverage. He is concerned about school concurrency. He likes the trail going thru the park. Also, without asking they included visitor parking.

Mr. Bennett states it is a logical spot for the mail kiosk.

Mr. Lutton asks about the secondary entrance on the North side of the property. Is this because there is not one on the East side?

Mr. Bennett responds that comments went back and forth on one versus two. There is merit to having two as another way in and out.

Mr. Lutton states he would like to get rid of it and have open space than a little secondary entrance. He states Hamlin has to be built.

Mr. Bennett stated Staff didn't get excited with the second entrance.

Mr. Lutton asks if it can be made for emergency vehicles only or turf block before it gets to final drawings?

Mr. Bennett states if Hamlin does get built and the stub out is there, it is a timing issue but maybe that access point goes away and they have a slightly larger park.

Mr. Lutton suggests how to pay for it once and turf block could do that or stabilize for emergency egress only because it is close to the next road. It doesn't feel right to him. He thinks as a Board they would like to review it with them. It is 130 ft plus the right of way.

Ms. Love asks if he wants that included in the conditions of approval.

Mr. Lutton responds it is up to the engineer if they want to get rid of it and just make it an emergency egress for firetrucks.

Ms. Love reads it states it is egress only and residents are not to enter.

Mr. Lutton asks if there is supposed to be a gate there?

Mr. Rice responds they contemplated this being an emergency access only. He states they did meet with the County and spoke with the City Fire Department. It is a County Road so they control access onto 11 th street. They did sit down with County and discuss with the Roads department these accesses and the functions. He states they are required to have a second access point by the County and that is why they have two access on 11th street. The issue with Hamlin is it is not built and they do not want to be married to another project they have no control over.

Mr. Lutton asks if Hamlin gets built later on it can be turf block?

Mr. Rice states this will be evaluated when Hamlin is in place.

Mr. Bennett states he understands Mr. Lutton's point.

Mr. Lutton then asks if they need to discuss further?

Ms. Love then makes a motion to recommend approval to City Commission of the 172 single family with Special Exception Use Permit with conditions of approval and waivers of strict compliance, The Board is adding a minimum floor area of 47 ft wide lots having a 1200 square ft, 52 ft wide lots having 1350 square ft. and 62 ft. wide lots having 1500 square ft. The Board is also adding a maximum lot coverage of 60 percent.

Mr. Lutton recognizes the motion and asks for a second.

Mr. McKibben seconds the motion.

Mr. Lutton calls for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton Yes	Vice- Chairman Charlene Bennett	John Gravel Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio Yes	Kyra Love Yes
--	--	-----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	------------------

Mr. Lutton states he likes the design and the presentation with the photographs was very helpful.

Other Business:

Mr. Bennett thanks the Board for their time for the special meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 PM



Attest: Shena Rowland



Chairman: Christopher Lutton