

**MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING  
October 25, 2022 5:30PM**

The City of Lake Wales Planning and Zoning Board held a meeting on October 25, 2022 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-Chair Kyra Love	Eugene Fultz	Casey McKibben	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal	Larry Bossarte
--------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	----------------	----------	--------------------	----------------

**City Staff:**

<b>Dept. of Planning and Development</b>
Mark J. Bennett – Director of Development Services Autumn Cochella – Assistant Director of Development Services Jasmine Khammany – Senior Planner Shena Rowland – Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER – Ms. Love called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL –Mr. Lutton and Mr. Rio were not present.

It was made known to the Board that Mr. Lutton did let Staff know in advance that he would be out of town. Mr. Rio was ill and did notify staff that he would be unable to attend. Ms. Rowland does ask the Board if they would like to make a motion to excuse the absences.

Ms. Love asks if anyone would like to make a motion to excuse the absences. Mr. Bossarte makes the motion and Ms. McCrystal seconds the motion. Motion is unanimously approved by voice vote.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
Meeting–August 23, 2022  
Mr. Bossarte makes a motion to approve with one correction on page 6 of changing RR to ARR in Mr. Bossarte’s comments.  
Mr. Fultz seconds the motion.  
Minutes approved unanimously by voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – Ms. Love 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.

She then opens the Communications and Petitions portion of the hearing asking if anyone would like to speak regarding an item not on the agenda? In seeing no movement she closes the floor to public comment and moves to the first agenda item.

## NEW BUSINESS

### 5. Hillpointe PDP

Review Staff report by Jasmine Khammany  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** Hillpointe PDP  
**APPLICANT:** Hillpointe LLC  
**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 advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Mr. Bennett adds that the first site plan that the applicant presented to staff had isolated apartment buildings in a sea of asphalt and staff did not feel that was appropriate to present to the Board. Staff did work with the applicant to come up with a better design.

Ms. Love asks if anyone has any clarifications or would they like to hear from the applicant?

Mr. Bossarte states he does not have any clarifications but would like to address parking.

Ms. Love asks if he would like to hear from the applicant.

Hunter Nimno from KPM Franklin introduces himself to the Board.

Mr. Bossarte states his first concern is that there is a request for a reduction in parking spaces from 1104 which calculates out to 2.1 spaces per dwelling unit to 835 which calculates down to 1.5 per dwelling unit. The second concern is the reduction in length of the parking spaces from 20 ft to 18 ft. He feels that a minimum of 2 spaces for a 2 bedroom dwelling unit is minimum standard. He is asking if the applicant has some experiences that he can share? He further states that statewide 30+ percent of the registered pickup trucks, his included is 20 ft long. He is thinking the spaces will be too tight and not enough. He asks how many visitor spaces are normally required?

Ms. Khammany responds that it is 1 for every 10 so it would be a total of 55 spaces.

Mr. Bossarte thinks that parking will end up being a nightmare. He asks if the aisle between the parking is 24 ft?

Ms. Love states that it is wider due to parallel parking.

Mr. Nimno agrees with this statement.

There is open discussion regarding this.

Mr. Bossarte states that he feels that with the elimination of visitor parking spaces and the 25 percent reduction dropping it down to 1.5 will make it very tight. Then if you have the 24 ft aisle with a couple of trucks hanging out will reduce that spacing. He feels it will be an awful situation with parking.

Mr. Nimno replies that they have requested a waiver to reduce the stalls to 10 ft x 18 ft from the standard 10 ft x 20 ft. They believe this helps increase the impervious surface area. They are dealing with a significant amount of wetlands and they are trying their best to reduce the impact to these wetlands. They believe that the reduction of these spaces will help them have an appropriate number of parking spaces. In regards to the reduction of the amount of parking spaces he refers to Lake Wales Code 23-306. This code requires that multifamily units to have 1.5 ratio. As a PDP Hillpointe is required to provide an additional 1 parking units per dwelling unit. In conversation with staff, it was recommended by staff that parking be located on the side and the rear of the building to avoid streetscape dominance by parking. In order to achieve this request the reduction in the number and size of spaces was needed.

Mr. Bossarte states he likes the repositioning of the parking, his concern is the number of spaces is minimal at best. He further states that the Federal Government is mandating by 2035 to have a lot of electric vehicles, not expecting them to prepare for that now but if the spaces are limited now, then trying to accommodate spaces for charging stations will be difficult. He did notice that in multifamily it states 1.5 spaces. Are the 2 spaces per dwelling unit including the visitor spaces?

Mr. Bennett responds that it does not include the visitor spaces, visitor parking is an additional standard.

Ms. Khammany clarifies that is for PDP.

Ms. Love asks if there are any further questions.

Mr. Fultz states that he shares the same concerns as Mr. Bossarte. He states he drives an extended cab truck and his truck sticks out about 3 ft. His concern would be that someone would hit his vehicle. If you look at the number of spaces provided per unit. If you have a husband and wife that both work and have separate vehicles, that is two spaces so it is already above the 1.5 spaces. Also, you cannot predict the size of the family that will move in. If you have a teenager driver, that also adds another vehicle.

Mr. Nimno defers to their traffic engineer.

David Gelalia of KPM Franklin introduces himself to the Board and clarifies the parking layout. He states the 10 ft x 18 ft space accounts for the 2 ft overhang in the landscape area around the parking lot. There is only one section that has head to head parking, the remainder is perimeter parking that has the 2 ft overhang which will account for the 20 ft. which will accommodate the length of the vehicles. In regards to the 1.5, the client has built multiple complexes using that ratio. That ratio fits their product and can supply data to prove this.

Mr. Bossarte again states that is a major concern, it isn't a retirement community so he feels that each unit will have multiple drivers.

Mr. McKibben asks that the time frame is for the rentals.

Mr. Nimno states it is one year.

Mr. McKibben states that he has seen these complexes in other areas, for instance St. Petersburg and there is constantly people moving in and moving out using the large trucks. He has seen that there is never enough space for parking. He states they are land restricted there and he would like to prevent that here.

Mr. Gelalia states he does have data he can provide.

Ms. Love asks if there are any further questions. She asks if Peddlers Pond has any say in the buffering? It is written that they will use what already exists.

Mr. Nimno states he does not believe so.

Ms. Love further asks if the road to the South will be extended out to Home Depot?

Mr. Nimno states that to the North they will be installing City Code standards, the buffering that is required.

Ms. Love asks if that was put in the proposal?

Ms. Khammany clarifies that they have the buffer, what was proposed was the buffer widths. They are like for like, 5 ft is usually required and they are providing a 10 ft buffer. It was more so commercial to residential areas will require more landscaping.

Ms. Love is confused as to how it is worded in the proposal. It states there is an existing buffer on the North side.

Ms. Khammany responds that there is an existing buffer, what they are proposing is a 10 ft buffer, she asks the applicant if they are now stating they willing to do a buffer?

Mr. Nimno states they will be doing what is required by City Code and Staff and what was previously worked out. He states if the existing buffer satisfies the Code requirements, they will not be adding. If it does not then they will be adding.

Ms. Khammany states where landscaping is needed is the parking perimeter is adjacent to the non residential.

Ms. Love states they are looking at a waiver of strict compliance that states to eliminate the landscape buffering around property boundaries so they would be using what Peddlers Pond has so Peddlers Pond would be responsible to maintain.

Ms. Khammany states they maintain the width. They do not need the landscaping on that portion. For example, for the portion behind the commercial components where the parking abuts, they would the trees 1 per 50 along those areas.

Mr. Nimno states if she is referring to the request for waiver along the Northern edge, those are conservation areas. These areas will be untouched and shows on the map.

Ms. Love understands and states it is clarified. She asks again about the road.

Mr. Nimmo states that is not their property.

Ms. Love then asks for further questions and in seeing none opens it up for public hearing.

Kathryn Price, citizen of Lake Wales approaches and asks about reducing the front setbacks from 30 ft to 10 ft and to eliminate the landscape buffers. She understands now about the landscape buffers but wants clarification on the setback reductions.

Ms. Khammany clarifies the setbacks visually on the map and explains the setbacks to Ms. Price.

Ms. Love then asks for further comments and in seeing no one she closes the public hearing to bring back for discussion. She further states that she had concerns about parking as well and pulled a similar project of Serenity to see what the recommendations were. She found that they had 74 extra spaces and only asked to reduce the size of those extra spaces. She is not comfortable in giving Hillpointe a reduction of spaces and reduction of size.

Mr. Bossarte clarifies that the City Ordinance of 2 is minimum standard, obviously they can do above this and they are asking for less than minimum.

Ms. Love states that they did not see the original submission so she is not sure of what needed to be done to get to this design. She is concerned with the functionality and practicality for the people who will live there.

Mr. Bennett states there is always trade off on site layout and design. This is an environmentally sensitive area, most of the site will be left undeveloped. He states the applicants point about more impervious surface means more encroachment into the environmentally sensitive areas he feels has merit. He states with a neo traditional design, the buildings are closer to the street and the parking is in the back, this is a trade off.

Ms. Love asks for clarification on the term neo traditional design. She asks if this refers to the way it is laid out or the building itself.

Mr. Bennett responds it is the way it is laid out.

Mr. McKibben brings up the point that we do not have the public transportation that larger city has so there is more driving.

Mr. Bennett asks Ms. Khammany or Ms. Cochella if they have any input?

Ms. Cochella states she will speak to the parking code, the minimum standard for parking in multifamily across the city is 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. The PDP standard is higher, she is not sure why but every multifamily project that is in excess of 12 units is a PDP. What it is saying is by code if you have 12 or less units it is 1.5 spaces anything above 12 units is 2. It is difficult to defend but it is in the code. She further states she does not have as much of an issue with the reduction in parking. She does like to depend on the end user to tell say how they will park their site.

Ms. Love states that another concern is the design is not amazing. It is a standard apartment. It isn't above and beyond. She cannot say it is a fair trade off to not building on the wetlands because they literally can't.

There is open discussion in regards to the wetlands.

Ms. Love states the only thing they can do is reduce units. She asks if they refuse to do the waiver to change the size, how will that impact the design.

Mr. Gelalia states it would effect the overall spacing of the buildings to roads. It would be a trickle down effect.

Mr. Mckibben asks what is an easier compromise for them, size or more spaces?

Ms. Love follows this question in stating the Board is struggling with the parking.

Nick Everly with Hillpointe LLC introduces himself and states he believes the preference would be more flexibility on the parking count. On the parking space size, they would be open to refine the statement, they would be okay with doing the 10 ft x 20 ft on the spaces that are head to head. The variance would be for perimeter parking where they have the overhang.

Mr. Bossarte states it is the total number of spaces.

Ms. Gelalia states he can provide the data that would support what they are proposing.

Mr. Bennett states a suggestion would be to have the applicant provide a parking study that justifies reduction of spaces.

Mr. Bossarte states he thinks a parking study would help immensely.

Ms. Love asks if these apartments are considered high end? What is the cost range?

Mr. Everly responds 1500-2000.

Ms. Love then mentions it may not always be at capacity.

Mr. Bennett states that if they do provide a parking study it will be passed along to the traffic consultants for review.

Ms. Love asks for a motion.

Mr. Bennett suggests to makes a motion to reduce required parking spaces from 1104 spaces to 835 spaces subject to review and approval of an alternate parking study by staff.

Ms. Love also mentions that the waiver should be for perimeter or non head to head spaces.

Mr. Bossarte states the parking study should also include visitor parking.

Mr. Bossarte makes a motion to recommend approval to City Commission of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval and Special Exception Use Permit with the following conditions: reduce the required parking spaces from 1104 spaces to 835 spaces and the elimination of visitor parking is subject to review and approval of an alternate parking study by Staff and to reduce the parking space size of 10 ft x 20 ft to 10 ft x 18 ft on the non-head to head parking spaces only.

Mr. McKibben seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

6. Regis Apartments PDP

COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – No Public in Attendance

Review Staff report by Jasmine Khammany  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** Regis Apartments  
**APPLICANT:** Charles Millar, Jr.  
**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 advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Mr. Shelton Rice representative for the applicant gives a presentation to the Board.

Ms. Charlotte Davis introduces herself to the Board as the traffic consultant for the project and gives a presentation.

Mr. Rice proceeds with his presentation at the conclusion of Ms. Davis' presentation.

Mr. Fultz responds that he is pleased that the traffic is being looked at and studied. He also comments the parking at 1.75 would be ok with him but he would like to see what the Board has to say.

Ms. Love asks if anyone has any further questions.

Mr. Bennett comments that the City Commission recently passed a Mobility Plan that serves as the basis for Staff to begin to charge a multi modal transportation impact fee. This is a tool for

Staff to get improvements done or granting impact fee credits for road improvements that are above and beyond what is required. This will begin November 17<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Love opens for a public hearing and in seeing no one she closes to the public and brings it back the Board for discussion.

Mr. Bossarte states he calculated based on number of bedrooms in units. He feels the 1.75 will work a little better.

Ms. Love asks about waiver 1, where did the lot size square footage?

Ms. Khammany states it refers to R-3 standards and it requires 12,000 for the first 3 and then 3000 for any additional.

Ms. Love understands.

Mr. Bossarte asks if additional spaces are required for the leasing office or fitness centers?

Ms. Love responds that would be the visitor parking, she then asks for clarification on what the visitor parking ratio is?

Ms. Khammany responds it is 1 for every 10 so about 27 spaces.

Ms. Love asks for a motion.

Ms. McCrystal makes a motion to recommend approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval and Special Exception Use Permit for a Residential PDP with Waivers of Strict Compliance and Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Fultz seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

7. Bok Estates – PDP

COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – No Public in Attendance

Review Staff report by Jasmine Khammany  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** Bok Estates  
**APPLICANT:** Bok Estates LLC.  
**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 advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Mr. Bennett states that Staff struggled with this project. The project does exceed the min of 20 percent open space. They asked the applicant to provide 25 percent and they did do that. There is still a concern about the amount of open space appearance. There is a condition that pertains to anti monotony. The intent is to avoid a monotonous look.

Ms. Love asks how that is enforced with townhomes when the idea is to have a uniformed look?

Mr. Bennett responds that is something the Board needs to discuss. Staff is concerned with a cookie cutter appearance. He states another issue is what makes this superior. He thinks there were three rounds of review and at this point it is best to just take it to the Board. He does ask the applicant to clarify if these are platted lots.

Will Carson introduces himself to the Board as the representative for Bok Estates LLC. He states the intent is to Plat the lots individually. The plan is to be rentals but they want the flexibility to sell. He states he is available for any questions. He then gives a brief presentation on the project and addresses the cookie cutter concern.

Ms. Cochella clarifies the difference between multi family and single family attached is if it is platted or not. If they are platted regardless if the same owner owns all the lots it is considered single family attached. If it is under one parcel ID then it is multi family.

Ms. Love asks if the plan is to start that way?

Ms. Cochella states it is considered single family attached. That is why the Board is seeing waivers to go from a single family residential lot side set back to 0.

Mr. Fultz is pleased they are looking at not going as the cookie cutter look.

Mr. Carson states they have no problem with working with Planning to alleviate this concern.

Mr. McKibben remembers that they struggled with zoning due to the proximity to Duke Energy.

Mr. Bossarte asks Mr. Bennett is the concern is green space.

Mr. Bennett states it is.

There is open discussion.

Mr. Carson states that they do have adequate green space and that every back yard will have their own area and there is about 30 ft between the buildings. He mentions the project that was completed in Davenport. He again states he has no issue in working with Planning.

There is open discussion regarding building space.

Mr. Carson states they are working with Duke in regards to sewer.

Mr. McKibben asks about the location of waivers. He believes they are missing a page.

Ms. Rowland points out where the waivers are in the packet. It is in the table.

Ms. Love asks for further questions and in seeing no one she opens to the public hearing.

Ellie Reyes with Gray Robinson, attorney for Mountain Lake Estates residents and Eric Dietz introduce themselves to the Board. Ms. Reyes speaks against the project with concerns of traffic impact to the area. She asks that the Board not approve for recommendation until an adequate traffic study is done. Mr. Dietz states the major concern is the traffic impact.

Ms. Khammany states they have presented their traffic methodology and it is under review with the consultant.

Mr. Carson does mention that the methodology has been presented and it is under review.

Ms. Khammany states that site development is where the traffic study comes into light.

Mr. Bennett states the traffic study is a two step process. The first is methodology and the second is the study.

Ms. Reyes again asks that the Board have a chance to review before it goes to City Commission.

Ms. Love asks if there is any one else who would like to speak. In seeing no one she closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board. She further states they normally do not ever have the traffic study at this stage.

Mr. Bennett clarifies this is part of the site development plan review.

Mr. McKibben states in the waiver, the minimum entrance road entrance reduced from 250 ft to 150 ft, he asks for reasoning?

Ms. Khammany states that means how many feet you have before you make your first turn.

Ms. Love asks for a motion.

Mr. McKibben makes a motion to recommend approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval and Special Exception Use Permit for a Residential PDP with Waivers of Strict Compliance and Conditions of Approval.  
 Ms. McCrystal seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

8. 315 Lincoln Avenue – Special Exception Use Permit

COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – No Public in Attendance

Review Staff report by Autumn Cochella  
 Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** 315 Lincoln Avenue  
**APPLICANT:** Kevin Blackman  
**APPROVAL:** Special Exception Use Permit to allow a Boarding Home in the C-1 Zoning District  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** Requirements have been met.

Ms. Cochella presents the staff report and advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Kevin Blackman introduces himself and gives a presentation to the Board.

Ms. Love asks if there are any questions.

Mr. Bossarte states it is a great project.

Ms. Love opens the public hearing and in seeing no movement closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Fultz makes a motion to approve the Special Exception Use Permit.

Mr. Bossarte seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

9. 282 Park Avenue – Land use and Zoning  
COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – No Public in Attendance

Review Staff report by Mark Bennett  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** 282 Park Avenue  
**APPLICANT:** Rob Quam  
**APPROVAL:** Future Land Use and Zoning Amendment  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** Requirements have been met.

Mr. Bennett presents the staff report and advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Ms. Love opens the public hearing and in seeing no movement she closes the hearing and brings it back to the Board for a motion.

Mr. McKibben recommends for approval to City Commission to reassign the following land use and zoning designations from the current Land use of LDR- Low Density Residential to proposed DD -Downtown District and the current zoning of R-1A to proposed zoning of C-1 Downtown Commercial.

Mr. Fultz seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

10. 139 Johnson Avenue – Major Site Plan

Review Staff report by Autumn Cochella  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** 139 Johnson Avenue  
**APPLICANT:** Crystal and Peggy Farrer  
**APPROVAL:** Site Plan Approval with Waivers of Strict Compliance for a Day Care Use in the C-2R Zoning District  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** Requirements have been met.

Ms. Cochella presents the staff report and advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Ms. Love asks if there are any questions for Staff or the applicant.

Ms. McCrystal for clarification on where the parking will be.

There is open discussion.

Ms. Cochella clarifies the parking.

Ms. McCrystal asks who maintains the alley.

Ms. Cochella states the City should be maintain.

There is open discussion regarding the project and location.

Ms. McCrystal asks if it is in and out and not like a regular school.

Ms. Cochella responds it is in and out.

Ms. Love then opens for a public hearing and in seeing no movement, she closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board for discussion or motion.

Ms. McCrystal makes a motion to approve the Site Plan with the Waivers of Strict Compliance.

Mr. Bossarte seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

#### 11. Oak Development – Land Use and Zoning

Review Staff report by Autumn Cochella

Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** Oak Development  
**APPLICANT:** Shelton T. Rice  
**APPROVAL:** Land Use and Zoning Map Amendment  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** Requirements have been met.

Ms. Cochella presents the staff report and advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Mr. Shelton Rice introduces himself and gives a brief presentation.

Ms. Love asks for any questions and in seeing none opens the public hearing. In seeing no movement she closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board.

Mr. Bossarte makes a motion to recommend approval to the City Commission to reassign the following Land Use and Zoning designations: Current Land Use Polk County Agricultural Rural Residential – ARR to Proposed Land Use Low Density Residential – LDR. Current Zoning Polk County Agricultural Residential – ARR to Proposed Zoning Residential – R-1A

Mr. Fultz seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for the next item.

12. Peak Property – Land Use and Zoning

Review Staff report by Mark Bennett  
Begin Report:

**PROJECT:** Peak Property  
**APPLICANT:** Tina Peak  
**APPROVAL:** Land Use and Zoning Map Amendment  
**PUBLIC HEARING:** Requirements have been met.

Mr. Bennett presents the staff report and advises that the applicant and staff are available for questions.

Ms. Love asks for any questions to the Board and in seeing none opens up for public hearing. In seeing no movement she closes the public hearing and brings it back to the Board for discussion or motion.

Mr. Fultz makes a motion to recommend to City Commission to reassign the following Land Use and Zoning designations: Current Land Use Polk Residential Suburban – RS to Proposed Land Use Low Density Residential – LDR. Current Zoning Polk County Residential Suburban – RS to Proposed Zoning Residential – R-1C

Ms. McCrystal seconds the motion.

Ms. Love asks for a roll call vote.

Chairman Christopher Lutton	Vice-Chair Kyra Love Yes	Eugene Fultz Yes	Casey McKibben Yes	Eric Rio	Courtney McCrystal Yes	Larry Bossarte Yes
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Ms. Love states it is approved and asks for other business.

Other Business:

Ms. Rowland asks the Board if they would like to move the November 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting to November 29<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. McKibben will be able to attend.

Ms. Love will be able to attend.

Ms. McCrystal will be able to attend.

Mr. Bossarte will be able to attend.

Mr. Fultz will be out of town.

The Board agrees to meet on Tuesday, November 29<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Love asks for further business.

Ms. Rowland asks the Board if they would like to have the 24 x36 plans delivered to their home when packets are delivered? It is the consensus of the Board to keep the packets the way they are with the 11 x 17 plans and to have a set of plans available for review on a table behind the dais. The packets are also being emailed electronically.

In seeing no other business to discuss, Ms. Love adjourns the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM

---

Attest: Shena Rowland

---

Chair: Christopher Lutton