

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, April 12, 2005, IN THE CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS (due to anticipated seating accommodations for the public), 100 NORTH U.S. 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.**

Members present: Donald Bergman (Chair), Sonja Gates (Vice Chair), Jeremiah Johnson, Margaret Benton, Thomas Knott, Harriett Brenner, Robert Poitier, Pamela Williams, and Chuck Enns.

Members absent: Charlie Harris

Citizens and Staff present:

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Ernesto Velasco      | Ramon Trias, AICP, Director of Development        |
| José F. Vazquez      | Wendy Clark, Planning Coordinator                 |
| Abraham Chabab       | Jim Walker, Assistant City Attorney               |
| Michael Swartz       | Dianna D. Rose, Secretary                         |
| Thomas Pentz         | Patricia A. Tobin, Director of Community Services |
| Brian Baumgardner    |   |
| Michael DiFrancesco  |   |
| Richard C. Laventure |   |

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. (**Agenda Item #1**).

Secretary proceeded with roll call and consideration of absences. (**Agenda Item #2**).

Ms. Rose stated – Mr. Harris called in and stated that if he was too late he would not be attending the meeting.

Mr. Bergman stated – If there is no objection, we could move the consideration of absences to the end to see if Mr. Harris shows up or not.

**Agenda Item #3 – Approval of minutes of meeting held March 8, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes from the March 8 meeting?

Mrs. Gates stated – I have a correction please. Just a typo, I think, on page 11 at the bottom, where it says “Mrs. Gates stated”...instead of “have” in the second sentence, it should be “having.” And in the last sentence could you please take out the words, “do they?”, okay thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other comments or corrections?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. POITIER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 2005 AS CORRECTED. Seconded by Mrs. Calvert. Unanimously approved by voice vote.**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

**Agenda Item #4 – Conditional Use – Kamlake Corporation** – Conditional use approval of an Adult Congregate Living Facility in a R-3, Single Family Moderate Density Zone. Located at 308 Souty 30<sup>th</sup> Street. Located at Nine (9) clients are proposed in the home. Owner is Kamlake Corporation, and applicant is Kamlawaty Lakram.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – In terms of density, the application is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan recommends less than 6.5 dwelling units per acre, and this application, in terms of density, is at 35 units per acre. Based on the inconsistencies, staff is recommending denial.

Mr. Bergman stated – Alright, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? Hearing none, we'll open the public hearing on the conditional use report. If there is anyone here who would like to speak on this item.

No one present to represent this item.

Mr. Bergman continued – Seeing there is no one, we'll close the public hearing. What's the pleasure of the Board?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO DENY THE CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Mrs. Gates.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, if I could?

Mr. Bergman – Yes.

Mr. Knott continued – Attached to this thing, it says there's an as-built drawing. It says as built on the last page. Just out of curiosity, is this thing in place? It shows all the rooms.

Ms. Clark stated – It's an existing residence.

Mr. Knott continued – With all these rooms that are shown on there, it looks like they were anticipating...that's all.

Mr. Bergman added – Well, this is a fire protection plan for 2002.

Mr. Knott – Interesting.

Mr. Enns added – Very large family.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other discussion on the motion? Could we have roll call please?

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

**Unanimously denied by roll call vote.**

**Agenda Item # 5 – Site Plan with Conditional Use – Santos Warehouse** – Approval for the construction of a warehouse facility. Located at 2107 Kirby Loop Road. Owner is Graciano Santos, and applicant is Velcon Group, Inc.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – This is a light industrial facility that will be divided into five (5) individual bays for tenants that are related to the construction trade industry. And staff is recommending approval conditioned upon the three (3) conditions in your recommendation, which are no outdoor storage, tenants shall be restricted to those included in the construction services industry, and there shall be no retail or any other type of use that would generate customers.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for staff from the Board?

Mrs. Brenner asked – Mr. Chairman, is there some safeguard to make sure they abide by those conditions?

Ms. Clark stated – Any occupational licenses that would come through for our review, we would check it against the file to make sure that it complies with the recommendations.

Mr. Enns stated – Mr. Chairman. Wendy, it says it's going to be divided into five (5) bays but on Cook & Menard's drawing, which I assume the hatched walls that actually, I guess shows it in just four (4) bays. But I don't really see how they could get a fifth bay out of there.

Ms. Clark stated – The applicant could probably clear that up. I was simply going by the application.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions of staff?

Mr. Johnson stated – Yes, I have one. Item #2 that you had recommended...tenants shall be restricted to those construction services of the industry. Any reason for that? I can understand the applicant, you know, stating up front that's whose his tenants are going to be, but ...

Ms. Clark stated – Based on the number of parking spaces that have been provided, they had calculated their parking based on warehousing. So, that's why the condition is there.

Mr. Johnson – Okay.

Mr. Enns stated – Mr. Chairman, how would safeguard that, Wendy, just when they would come in for occupational license?

Ms. Clark stated – Because we would review it in accordance with an applications that we have previously.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Enns continued – So, somebody that would lease that bay would have to come in and get an occupational license?

Ms. Clark stated – Right. We would check the zoning, and it's like, oh, it's C-3, so they must have applied for some type of conditional use application, which we would have on file.

Mr. Trias stated – Mr. Chairman, one of the concerns in these type of activities always is the fact that sometimes they evolve into something much bigger than they're supposed to. And the uses that should be in that commercial building end up in the warehouse. Code Enforcement, sometimes is the other way to deal with this issue. But that is the reason why we have those conditions.

Mr. Enns – Okay.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for staff? Okay, we can open the public hearing. If there is anyone here who wishes to speak on this project?

Mr. Ernesto Velasco stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with the Velcon Group. And I'd like to address the one question about the subject of five (5) bays. Originally we intended to have five (5) bays. We had some constraints on this site regarding the drainage and the parking and all of our site configurations. We had to bring it down to four (4). I'm not sure if our site plan got updated, but certainly Mr. Cook's drawing does reflect the correct number of bays; so we're down to four (4).

Mrs. Brenner stated – Mr. Velasco, could I ask you to speak up ....or turn the mike up a little bit...we can barely hear you.

Mr. Velasco stated – I'm sorry, would you like me to repeat...?

Mrs. Brenner stated – No, that's alright, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Knott asked – Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. Just where is this? Is this across from the college?

Mr. Velasco stated – No, it's a perpendicular...no, I'm sorry...37<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Knott stated – It says 35<sup>th</sup>, that's on the west side of the college isn't it?

Mr. Velasco stated – This goes between Virginia and Okeechobee. It's that little cut-through. If you were standing at the college, it would be to the west, the first street that goes north.

Mr. Johnson added – North of Virginia, Tom.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott stated – Oh, okay. Oh, I'm sorry. I see Virginia...I was looking at that, okay. One other question...do you have any idea of what size...what type of warehousing is going to be in there...what type of trucks are going to be coming in and out of there?

Mr. Velasco stated – No. Mr. Santos was intending to have this as an income producing property for him. He is in the construction trade, and his clients will probably be people that work with him in this scenario.

Mr. Knott asked – Okay, so this is a ...it won't be a...these bays aren't big enough to have a...these are sort of like...small commercial ...?

Mr. Velasco stated – Typical of this would be a plumber or again, have some pipe in there...

Mr. Knott added – Or a contractor of some sort.

Mr. Velasco – Exactly.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Velasco – Alright.

Mr. Enns stated – I just have a quick question on the two (2) proposed detention areas. Why is the one in the rear ...the building there...is that just to take the water that is coming off the building on the back side of the building?

Mr. Velasco stated – We needed a certain amount of detention on site, and we couldn't do it with just one. We had to go and find a space where we could put the balance of that water, and the only available spot was back there.

Mr. Enns continued – So, you couldn't take the front one any deeper?

Mr. Velasco – Right.

Mr. Enns stated – I gotcha, okay.

Mr. Johnson stated – I think there is a little conflict. I picked it up...I think so. On the site plan that was produced, it shows a drain field septic tank system. Is there not sanitary sewer in this area?

Mr. Velasco stated – There is, and again, I'm sorry if you don't have the latest drawings, but we had changed that. That was one of the comments that we had when we went into the review committee. The utilities informed us that there was sewer available, so now we have a pump station for that site.

Mr. Johnson – Okay, thank you.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Gates stated – I have a question. On the front elevation of your building, I see your little detailing here. Are you going to improve that? Because I think it looks...

Mr. Velasco stated – I'm at a loss there....could I take a look at that please?

Mrs. Gates – Sure.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Knott stated – Just a quick question on the site. Is this the site where somebody has put a lot of fill material right now?

Mr. Velasco stated – There was some...it was cleared some time ago. And there was some fill put in some time ago as well.

Mr. Knott added – Yes, there's a lot of fill on there right now...

Mr. Velasco stated – Now, there probably is. I have not been there recently. I was there on the site maybe three (3) months ago when we started the project.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay...I know where it's at. Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions?

Mrs. Brenner asked – May I go back to staff?

Mr. Bergman – Certainly.

Mrs. Brenner continued – Wendy, according to our drawing of the surrounding properties, it's in a C-3, yes. It only shows three (3) R-3's across the street and in the neighborhood. Are those the residential properties that we know of in that area?

Ms. Clark stated – I'm not really sure what the scale is for the zoning map you received.

Mr. Trias added – Mrs. Brenner, the only colored areas on the map are the ones within the City.

Mrs. Brenner – Right.

Mr. Trias continued – So, in the county, I anticipate, it's pretty much the same type of development, but it's just not labeled because it's in the county.

Mrs. Brenner continued – I did not go out there but I believe that that 34<sup>th</sup> Street is largely a residential street, so it's really close to the residential portion...realizing that the rest is C-3.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Ms. Benton asked – In the C-3 area how much other industrial usage is there...if you know?

Ms. Clark stated – I can't answer that at this time. The only thing that we have would be the zoning map, not existing land use.

Mr. Bergman added – I don't know if there's anything along that street until you get to that northwest and northeast corners. I think there's the old Greyhound Station. I think there's an auctioneer's metal building up there on the northwest corner.

Mr. Knott added – A tire center, I think on there...

Mr. Enns added – A feed store...

Mr. Bergman asked – Alright, is there any other questions? Is there anyone else here who wishes to speak on this project? If not, we'll close the public hearing and entertain a motion.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. BENTON TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE UPON THE CONDITIONS OF STAFF: 1) NO OUTDOOR STORAGE, 2) TENANTS SHALL BE RESTRICTED TO THOSE INCLUDED IN THE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES INDUSTRY, AND 3) THERE SHALL BE NO RETAIL OR ANY OTHER TYPE OF USE THAT WOULD GENERATE CUSTOMERS. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Approved by roll call vote of 8 – 1.**

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, this will go to the City Commission and the City Clerk's Office will notify you when that will be heard.

Mr. Velasco – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman – Good Luck.

**Agenda Item #6 – Site Plan – Dunkin Donuts** – Approval to allow the construction of a fast food restaurant and office building. Generally located on the southeast corner of S. U.S. 1 & Tennessee Ave. Owner is Michael Matakaetis of Dimamafo, LLC, and applicant is José Vazquez.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – The project consists of two (2) separate buildings, one being the fast food restaurant, and the other being a two-story office building. And staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, thank you. Are there any questions of staff from the Board? No questions of staff? We can open the public hearing. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on this project?

Mr. Abraham Chabab stood and introduced himself and stated – (We're?) the engineer for this job. As what he said, the proposed plan is to have a Dunkin Donuts in the front and a two-story office building in the rear. We have provided 52 parking spaces with sidewalks all around at Tennessee Avenue on U.S. 1. If you have any questions, we'll be happy to answer it.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Are there any questions of the applicant?

Mr. Johnson asked – Mr. Chair, in working with this project with D.O.T., have they made any recommendations for any kind of a turning lane or anything like that? Have they talked to you about...?

Mr. Chabab stated – D.O.T. would like to have approval from the City before they start reviewing this project. So, we're waiting on City approval before we start submitting to D.O.T.

Mr. Johnson stated – Okay. They haven't said anything about the possible expansion of U.S. 1 later on and working into your project here? I know they haven't applied for it but, they haven't given you any indication of changing U.S. 1 at all?

Mr. Chabab stated – No. When we reviewed through the engineer department, Nick Mims mentioned that the State is working on expanding this boulevard but we haven't heard anything about taking some part of our right-of-way.

Mr. Johnson – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, just for the record. On sheet C-1, which is the site plan. Just for clarity, I just wanted to make sure there's something awry with your computer, I guess, because you have 4' 3" parking spaces.

Mr. Chabab stated – We were aware of the technical errors, but it was too late to resubmit the new one. If you like us to resubmit it...

Mr. Knott stated – Well, as long as everybody is aware of and staff's aware of it then...because all of the dimensions are bogus.

Mr. Chabab continued – Apparently. The correct dimensions are 24 X 36.

Mr. Knott added – It's just that all of the dimensions, I think, are off it looks like...hit the wrong key or something in autocad.

Mr. Enns asked – Does that lessen the number of spaces....?

Mr. Knott stated – I don't know...they've got 11...I was just looking on the south side up there. The 11 spaces that are 47.7 ft. for an average of 4 ft. wide...you see what I'm saying, Don?

Mr. Trias added – All of the dimensions are wrong...all of them.

Mr. Knott stated – Just as long as the staff knows and that they get a corrected one to the City Commission.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman stated – I have a question for staff. Ramon or Wendy, is there an issue with the driveway distance from the center line of Tennessee? I mean, isn't that normally 100 ft. or 150 ft. from the adjacent roads to the driveway? Did staff have an issue with it when they were reviewing it?

Ms. Clark stated – It was reviewed by engineering and there was no issue that was brought up with the distance separation.

Mr. Trias asked – Are you saying the distance from U.S. 1?

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, it would probably be like a local street...I thought the distance was like 100 ft. from the center line to the center line of the driveway. With the dimensions off I can't tell what the dimensions are.

Mr. Bergman asked – Were there any other questions for the applicant?

Mrs. Brenner asked – What about the office building? No one has spoken about that at all. Can you tell us more about the office building that has not been included in the discussion?

Mr. Chabab stated – It's a professional office building with bays...two-story building...

Mrs. Brenner asked – With bays?

Mr. Chabab continued – Yes. They will be leased to professionals. The bays will range from 800 to 1,500 sq. ft.

Mrs. Brenner continued – And has the fire department signed off to the access to this property?

Mr. Chabab asked – In reference to site plan or building plan?

Mrs. Brenner stated – Well, in general...will they be able to get their trucks back in there?

Mr. Chabab stated – They have no objection to the way we designed it.

Mrs. Brenner asked – That is a retention pond behind there...is that correct?

Mr. Chabab – That's correct.

Mrs. Brenner continued – And you're going to anticipate how many spaces will there be in the building?

Mr. José Vazquez stood and introduced himself and stated – And the downstairs is the only floor that is going to be divided at this point. The upstairs...the owner is going to using that entire floor for his accounting services. So, it's only going to be leasable spaces at the downstairs. The whole entire second floor will be one tenant.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Brenner – Okay.

Mr. Bergman asked – Who is the architect on this project?

Mr. Vazquez stated – Greg (Burke?)

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mrs. Brenner asked – We just had the one drawing for the building itself? No elevations...?

Mr. Bergman stated – There are elevations in there.

Mr. Vazquez stated – The elevations should be included in the package, yes.

Mrs. Brenner – Alright, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Were there any other questions? Alright, thank you.

Mr. Vazquez – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman stated – Before we close the public, is there anyone else here that wishes to speak? Alright, I'll close the public hearing and entertain a motion from the Board.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. BRENNER TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WITH CONDITIONAL USE. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicants – You'll be notified by the City Clerk when this goes to City Commission. Make sure you get your site plan dimensions straightened out, because they will certainly question that.

Mr. Chabab stated – Yes, I will talk to Wendy about it. Thank you very much.

**Agenda Item #7 – Site Plan – Lawnwood E.R.** – Approval for an addition to the Emergency Department of Lawnwood Regional Medical Center. Located at 1700 S. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Owner is Lawnwood Medical Center, Inc., applicant is Thomas R. Pentz, CEO, and representative is Michael Swartz, of Miller Legg & Associates, Inc.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – The project consists of a 12,000 sq. ft. addition to the Emergency Room at Lawnwood. The site plan also includes an additional parking lot, which will serve the expanded facility. And staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Are there any questions of staff?

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman. Wendy, I can't recall, was there a tree survey as a part of this submittal? Oh yes, here we go. Yes, there one in there, yes. I was just going to say, I'm sure they've met with Mr. Williams about ...

Mr. Clark stated – Yes. There was a tree survey that was prepared as well as a tree location plan that was approved by Paul Williams.

Mr. Knott stated – Yes, I see it now. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman asked – Wendy, that 12,000 sq. ft. addition, is that a net increase over what's there or is that just ...? Because it looks like they're taking part of the existing overhang and made it part of the lobby office? I can't tell from these plans. It looks like there's a structure...an overhang there now...

Ms. Clark stated – Yes. The applicant could probably better explain that.

Mr. Bergman – Okay. Are there any other questions of staff? Alright, we can open the public hearing for anyone who wishes to speak on the site plan.

Mr. Michael Swartz stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Miller Legg & Associates, Inc. representing the applicant. To answer your question, it is a 6,000 sq. ft. brand new addition to the facility. It's a 12,000 net gain for the Emergency Department. They're renovating an existing 6,000 sq. ft. building a new 6,000 sq. ft to totally renovate the entire Emergency Department.

Mr. Bergman – Okay.

Mr. Swartz continued – As you can see by the site plan, we're also promoting a better circulation pattern throughout the site to serve the Emergency Room. Currently the Emergency Department has pretty much the patient and ambulance entrance in very close proximity to each other. We're separating that to provide better service to the community and to provide better traffic flow. To answer your question previously about the tree relocations. We have met with Gary on this project. We're making every attempt we can to save the existing oak trees, which are of unique value to the site and to mitigate those that cannot be saved. As I'm sure, most of you are aware (Occo?), which is State agency for health care review has certain requirements for trees within the Emergency Department drive aisles. You can only have trees or shrubs of certain height so in case they fall over during a storm they're not blocking traffic pattern. With that, if you guys have any further questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is the parking that is east of the helicopter pad, is that Emergency Room parking?

Mr. Swartz stated – Yes, sir.

Mr. Bergman continued – Okay, that was reserved for...

Mr. Swartz added – ...for physicians previously. We're relocating the physician parking.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – How did they take that?

Mr. Swartz stated – They took it pretty well.

Light laughter.

Mr. Bergman added – That had always been an issue there...the lack of parking for the Emergency Room has been excessively short.

Mr. Swartz stated – Yes, we recognized that as part of this project that needs to improve. And that is one of the major components of this project is to give a reasonable amount of parking spaces for the Emergency Department in close proximity to the E.R.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay, good.

Mrs. Brenner stated – I have a real problem with the drawing of the facility itself. I can't figure out where the ambulances are coming in and where they're going to bring the patients in. You have a walk-in entry at one point and then you have an ambulance entry at the other point?

Mr. Swartz – Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Brenner continued – Are these going to impede each other?

Mr. Swartz – No.

Mrs. Brenner continued – You're going to go through one to get to the other?

Mr. Swartz stated – You do not have to go through one to get to the other. Your access will be off of Nebraska Blvd. (should be Ave.) for the Emergency Department. Anybody going to the Emergency Department, whether it be patient or ambulance, will be directed to the Nebraska Blvd. (should be Ave.) entrance. Once you come up on Nebraska Blvd. (should be Ave.), there will proper signage provided directing the patients to their prospective patient drop-off point and directing the ambulances to their prospective ambulance drop-off point. As you'll see to the left, that's the ambulance entry. They'll come in, they'll turn, they'll drop under the canopy, and they can exist the same way. The patients will come in off Nebraska and pretty much go straight right on into the patient entrance. And that was done that way to hopefully not promote any confusion amongst patients or people dropping patients off. If you're coming in off Nebraska, you pretty much have a straight shot right to the patient drop-off. I assume you're going to rework the turning radius on Nebraska? Are you working with ...?

Mr. Swartz stated – Yes, we're working with the City to rework the turning radius as necessary to meet the requirements for the ambulances. Currently the ambulances come in off of Nebraska right now anyway.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Brenner continued – It's very narrow through there, so you are expanding that turning basin, so to speak?

Mr. Swartz – Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Gates stated – I have a question. As I see it here, and maybe you can explain this to me better, if I'm not understanding this, your Emergent Care ...your currently capacity is three (3) and after the project it's going to be up to six (6)? Could you explain that number to me? I just want to understand...

Mr. Swartz stated – I'm not sure I understand the question, ma'am.

Mrs. Brenner & Mrs. Gates added – Upper right-hand corner.

Mrs. Gates continued – If you could explain that to me please. Is this in reference to bays or per patient?...is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Swartz stated – I believe the current capacity for the Emergent Care, there are three (3), for lack of better terms, bays. Under the new project, there will be six (6) Emergent Care stations, 17 urgent care stations, five (5) non-urgent care stations, and eight (8) patient holding areas.

Mrs. Gates asked – So, there will not be a change in the patient holding area from what it is now?

Mr. Swartz stated – No ma'am, but they believe that, and the research has shown, through the facility research, that by increasing the Emergent Care and the Urgent Care by the amounts they are increasing, they believe that will help to bring down the patient holding that is currently there right now.

Mrs. Gates stated – You do think that? Because that concerns me, and the fact that I'm looking...

Mr. Swartz added – And your concerns are shared throughout the facility as well.

Mrs. Gates continued – If you're going to add this kind of expansion on, I would like to see both the patient holding and the non-urgent care holding or bays, rather, have a little increase. But I can understand from your point of view, increasing the other.

Mr. Swartz – Right.

Mrs. Gates continued – I'm just surprised that the numbers aren't changing in ...

Mr. Thomas R. Pentz stood and stated – It will increase the capacity. And what we're doing is adding more physicians to the Emergency Room.

Mrs. Gates – Oh, you are?

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Pentz continued – And when you're talking about the E.R. being, that will still be there as a hold for patients. This will eliminate the holds that occur in the Emergency Room right now. In the main corridor it's horrible. But what we have done in immediate time is to add some physician extenders and open an Urgent Care area on the side of the hospital. That goes from, I think, 11 o'clock in the morning to 11 o'clock. And we're getting ready to add another E.R. physician. But this will eliminate the holds in the Emergency Room. That's the concept of it, I think it's going to add, I think, another seven (7) or eight (8) more bays. Another thing we're adding too, is three (3) large trauma rooms, in which we don't have now. We've only got really one (1). So, this will help out when trauma comes in as opposed to putting them in the Emergency Room like we've got now or one of those small bays. Does that answer your question?

Mrs. Gates stated – Yes it does.

Ms. Rose (secretary) asked – Your name please, sir?

Mr. Thomas R. Pentz introduced himself

Mrs. Brenner asked – May I ask you a question?

Mr. Pentz – Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Brenner continued – I only see one, perhaps I'm looking incorrectly, you have two (2) triage units but they're at the end of the walk-in end?

Mr. Pentz – Yes.

Mr. Brenner continued – There are no triage units on the ambulance end?

Mr. Brian Bumgardner stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with the hospital ...and yes, ma'am that is correct. We have two (2) triage areas now for our walk-in area. The existing Emergency Room today has one (1). The new one has two (2) and if you look at the way the desks are set up, there are three (3) areas but two (2) are labeled triage, one (1) is the reception area to cover that. Our Emergency entrance for the ambulances ...those patients come directly into the Emergency Room and we're assuming that those are acute. They come directly in and don't have to be triaged.

Mrs. Brenner continued – Okay, you're going to assume that when they come in, if there are three (3) ambulances they're going to be triaged immediately as they come in?

Mr. Bumgardner stated – Yes, ma'am. That's how we currently handle it.

Mrs. Brenner asked – And you're only going to have one (1) nurses station at the ...

Mr. Bumgardner stated – No, there are actually two (2) separate nurses stations in there. I think it's just small in the existing area. There's a nursing station there that we're expanding and renovating, and then

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

there's the new area as well, which is the large drawing. And I think your drawing is oriented the way mine is, so it would be to the left and if you'll as well, the trauma rooms that Mr. Pentz spoke about...the acute care rooms...those are directly in front of those nursing areas...they can be visualized by the nursing staff.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bumbardner – Sure.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions?

Ms. Benton stated – Just for clarification. You have two (2) here for the ambulances ...

Mr. Bumgardner stated – One (1) canopy for the ambulance, one (1) canopy is for the patient drop-off.

Ms. Benton – Okay.

Mr. Poitier added – They sure need it. I know that.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions? Thank you.

Mr. Bumgardner – Thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Is there anyone else wishing to speak on the Lawnwood site plan? If not, we will close the public hearing. And I'll entertain a motion.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. GATES TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN. Seconded by Mrs. Brenner. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicants – You will notified by the City Clerk when this goes to City Commission. Good luck.

Applicants stated – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman stated – As a reminder, make sure we focus on the site requirements that we're here to review. I don't have a problem asking questions, but I ask that we not get too distracted...the floor plan, because that's pretty much out of our control.

Mrs. Brenner stated – I know that. The only reason I was asking was because of the entrance from the two (2) places.

Mr. Bergman added – Well the Emergency Room in Fort Pierce has been (petitioned) for a long time. Everybody has taken an interest in it. So, try to remember on the site plans we need to stick to technical requirements that we're supposed to be reviewing.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you.

**Agenda Item # 8 – Site Plan – Five Mile Creek** – Approval for a commercial parcel development. Generally located on the south side of Okeechobee Road adjacent to Five Mile Creek. Owner is Rob Steiner, Manger of Creekside 8 LLC, and applicant is Troy Holloway, of Gentile, Holloway, O’Mahoney, Inc.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – The project consists of four (4) separate buildings with a variety of intended uses, being retail, office, and restaurant. And staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Bergman stated – Are there any questions of staff from the Board? We can open the public hearing on this. Is there anyone here to speak on the site plan?

Mr. Troy Holloway stood and introduced himself and stated – I’m with Gentile, Holloway, O’Mahoney & Associates. And I’m basically just here to answer any questions you may have on the project.

Mr. Bergman asked – We have any questions for the applicant?

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity, I can’t find it in my packet, do we know what the restaurant ...the particulars of the development...is there an anchor going here...an regional anchor...who that might be...do you have any of that information?

Mr. Holloway stated – No. At this point, we do not have a retail anchor, and that’s why the restaurant is shown as future. Until we have a certain restaurant, then we will come back in with the architecture on that. But we are looking for more of a high quality restaurant for this center.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay, the size of the anchor...what category would fall into that...a supermarket or a...?

Mr. Holloway asked – Either like a craft store...a smaller sized Eckerd’s(now CVS)...Walgreen’s ...they have the smaller, you know, 10,000 sq. ft. size.

Mr. Knott asked – Bed, Bath & Beyond-type thing or something like that?

Mr. Holloway stated – Yes. That type of use...Linens & Things.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay, very good, thank you. One other question. You could only work one (1) entrance into your project? Is that adequate for fire protection and what have you?

Mr. Holloway stated – Yes. We do have, also, on the western property boundary a future access drive. I guess just a quick little history. The previous plan generation to this, we were proposing a joint driveway at the existing median opening that would split and share both properties. But the property owners to the west, I guess there plan is for that driveway to remain only on their property line.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Knott – Oh I see.

Mr. Holloway continued – We do show a future access that would tie into that driveway when it comes through.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Holloway – Yes.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any other questions for the applicant?

Mrs. Brenner stated – I have one question. Are these going to be just like box buildings? Are they going to be four walls, a ceiling, and a floor? Are they going to be more like a Home Depot or are they going to be more like a business construction?

Mr. Holloway stated – I'm not sure. Are you talking architecturally-wise on the exterior of the building?

Mrs. Brenner – Yes.

Mr. Holloway continued – It's not going to be a Home Depot, no. All these are covered arcades. All the pedestrian walks are brick. It's very nice architecture. It's not just your basic Home Depot...Wal-Mart by any means, no. I consider it more high-end uses in architecture.

Mrs. Brenner – Thank you,

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman, just one more question of the applicant. Since you don't have any....what's your construction schedule? Do you have a schedule for construction on this?

Mr. Holloway stated – It's probably going to, I would say, probably four (4) months after our final approval...there are tenets that have tentatively confirmed to go into this, but I guess right now there is no restaurant and there is no main anchor.

Mr. Knott added – None of the anchors but you do have the retail space that ...

Mr. Holloway stated – Yes, the construction would proceed and ..

Mr. Knott added - ...and would start with those.

Mr. Holloway added – And typically that's when everybody then begins to sign up.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay, thank you very much.

Mr. Holloway – Yes.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Ramon, did staff have any problems with the elevations? Did they look like they were going to work alright?

Mr. Trias stated – We had extensive discussions about design and they were all very productive. So, I think it's going in the right way.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions? Is there anyone else here to speak on the site plan? If not, we will close the public hearing, and entertain a motion from the Board.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – Alright, you'll be notified by the City Clerk when this is going to be heard at the City Commission meeting.

Mr. Holloway – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman – You're welcome.

**Agenda Item #9 – Subdivision – Pioneer Park** – Approval to subdivide a parcel of land of 3.5 acres into 20 separate lots. Generally located at Avenue M & 29<sup>th</sup> Street. Owner/applicant is City of Fort Pierce, and representative is Patricia A. Tobin, Director of Community Services.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – The subdivision is a City-initiated project. It is intended for single-family development. And each of the lots with the requirements for the R-4 zoning district with the exception of the corner lots, in terms of lot width. And staff is recommending approval conditioned upon the less-than-adequate corner lot width be submitted to the Board of Adjustment for approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions of staff from the Board? We can open the public hearing. Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the project.

Ms. Patricia A. Tobin stood and introduced herself and stated – I'm with the City of Fort Pierce. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman. Patty, has the City gotten into the subdivision business before? Or is this the first for the City?

Ms. Tobin stated – I haven't done any research but I would venture to guess it's the first, although the City has helped other developments...I think Palm Walk is an example of another subdivision that was assisted with the same dollars that we would be using for this development.

Mr. Knott asked – So, City funds will pay for the site improvements...all of the infrastructure? Is that correct?

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Ms. Tobin stated – It’s actually Federal funds...Community Development Block Grant funds.

Mr. Knott asked – But once the infrastructure’s in and ...these are fee simple?

Ms. Tobin – That’s correct.

Mr. Knott continued – I mean, they’re gone...the City’s out of it after that...is that...?

Ms. Tobin – That’s out goal.

Mr. Knott continued – Who will own the retention pond?

Ms. Tobin stated – That will be owned by the City...it’s a part of the plat.

Mrs. Knott stated – So, it will be part of the street maintenance and the infrastructure...okay. I didn’t realize that the City...it’s good that uh....will we all be assisting at all with the financing of these?

Ms. Tobin stated – We will be assisting in whatever way we have to, to make this project work.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Ms. Tobin added – And that does include down payment assistance, mortgage buy down, infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Knott continued – Alright. Are there subsidies that go with this or ...?

Ms. Tobin stated – There are all kinds of programs. We’ve got Federal, we’ve got State dollars, we’ve actually got Federal Home Loan Bank dollars, S.H.I.P would be State dollars...Harbor Federal is also partnering with us. We have a bunch of partners. So, it should work.

Mr. Knott stated – I was wondering how the local folks were taking you all getting into competition with them, but evidently they’re joining in with you on this.

Ms. Tobin stated – I don’t know if we would be doing it if there was competition. Hopefully what we will be doing will be spurring that competition.

Mr. Knott – Okay.

Ms. Tobin continued – Values have changed everywhere in the City of Fort Pierce, and this is just going to be one area.

Mr. Knott stated – That’s great...very good, thank you.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mrs. Brenner added – Mr. Knott, you might like to know that that property came from the Housing Authority.

Ms. Tobin stated – That’s true...we bought it actually.

Mrs. Brenner continued – Yes. But it was Housing Authority property that was made available for them to purchase.

Mr. Knott – Yes.

Ms. Tobin added – It’s actually my understanding that Neighborhood Housing Services owned it first.

Mrs. Brenner – Right.

Ms. Tobin continued – Then they gave it to the Housing Authority and then we (the City) bought it from the Housing Authority.

Mrs. Brenner – Exactly.

Mr. Knott stated – Well, that’s good...a nice use of that land. It’s needed....this type of housing. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman stated – Wendy, you mentioned that we’re going to have to get Board of Adjustment approval on the non-conforming corner lot. Is that lot #20?

Ms. Tobin added – There are four (4) corner lots.

Ms. Clark agreed – Yes.

Ms. Tobin continued – And I would actually like some assistance or direction maybe from the attorney. I have received variances to the front yard setback.

Ms. Clark added – Right, setbacks.

Ms. Tobin continued – Sideyard street setback. We meet the minimum lot width requirements for the R-4 zoning. The 75-ft. corner lot requirement is actually a part of the subdivision regulations. Subdivision regulations don’t have any variance provisions. And the variance provisions of the zoning code don’t apply to anything but the zoning code. So, I believe that we can work this out. I believe that the community has probably approved developments similar to this. My roads are also not going to meet the subdivision regulations, which are a 60-ft. requirement. I’ve worked with the City Engineering office and they’ve suggested with curb and gutter we can go down to 50 ft...that’s not a problem. So, I think we can find a way to address this other than a variance, because I don’t think a variance is the appropriate procedure or process for what we’re doing.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – What would the variance be for...for the setback requirement?

Ms. Tobin stated – Be up to the subdivision regulations...up to 75-ft. corner lot width. The lot width in R-4 is 50.

Mr. Trias added – Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we can come up with a legal way to do this. At this point, and from my point of view, it's paperwork unless you have an objection to the design.

Mr. Bergman stated – No, I was just thinking unless there's something to do with the platting of a non-conforming lot...the way the code is, even if it's a non-conforming lot, you can still build a single-family residence on it...

Mr. Trias added – If it's already platted.

Ms. Tobin added – Then it becomes non-conforming. We're creating it here...

Mr. Trias added – I'm sure with the advice of our very confident attorney we will be able to work this out.

Mr. Bergman – Alright...good. Okay, are there any other questions for the applicant? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing. What is the pleasure of the Board?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. BRENNER TO APPROVE THE SUBDIVISION WITH THE CONDITION THAT A VARIANCE BE APPLIED FOR BEFORE THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR CORNER LOT WIDTH. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Ms. Tobin – Thank you very much.

Mr. Bergman – Thank you.

Mr. Poitier – Good luck.

**Agenda Item #10 – Abandonment – Osceola Estates** – Approval to abandon a portion of City right-of-way. Generally located between Oleander Avenue & 7<sup>th</sup> Street Canal. Owner/applicant is Michael DiFrancesco, President of Indian Run Development, and representative is Richard Laventure of Laventure & Associates, Inc.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – A single-family subdivision was previously approved at this location. The applicant is requesting to abandon the unimproved right-of-way known as Osceola Avenue; and to also install a new cul-de-sac right-of-way that will be dedicated to the public and it serve access to each single-family lot. And staff is recommending approval conditioned upon that the new right-of-way be in conformance with Chapter 18, which is subdivision regulations.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Wendy, did you get a ....is there any information...? They're talking about putting a cul-de-sac in?

Ms. Clark – Yes.

Mr. Bergman continued – Is that something that they'll do through ...just the City Engineering to be permitted?

Ms. Clark stated – Right. It's my understanding it's already in the Engineering Department for their review.

Mr. Bergman stated – I was just curious how it was going to look on the actual subdivision...

Ms. Clark stated – Actually you've seen the subdivision, and it did show the cul-de-sac as accessed.

Mr. Bergman stated – Okay. Were there any questions for staff?

Mr. Knott stated – Mr. Chairman. Wendy, was this just the normal routine to come forward for this, or was this an oversight with the original application?

Ms. Clark stated – I think it probably was an oversight.

Mr. Knott continued – Okay. So, for alignment and for development purposes they just need to ...?

Ms. Clark stated – Right, to abandon the old, and install the new.

Mr. Trias added – They're realigning the street from a design point of view.

Mr. Knott stated – Okay. That's a nice subdivision there...

Mr. Trias stated – Yes, pretty straight forward.

Mr. Knott – Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for staff? We can open the public hearing. Is there anyone here to speak on behalf of the abandonment?

Mr. Richard Laventure stood and introduced himself and stated – I'm with Laventure & Associates in Port Saint Lucie. Mr. DiFrancesco is here also to answer any questions you may have. The first question about the subdivision plat and the cul-de-sac...I have a copy of the approved plan if you're interested in seeing it. And again, it is something that you have seen before.

Mr. Bergman stated – That's fine...

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Laventure continued – The second question was, I don't believe it was an oversight. Up until this point, we've always extinguished old right-of-way with a new subdivision plat. In the 20 years or so I've been doing this we've gotten approval up until this point base on a new platted right-of-way typically extinguishes an old platted right-of-way. And that's all we were trying to do here...we weren't trying to run one by the City or otherwise.

Mr. Knott – No problem.

Mr. Bergman stated – Thank you. Is there any other questions for the applicant? Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? We'll close the public hearing. What's the pleasure of the Board?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO APPROVE THE ABANDONMENT OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY. Seconded by Ms. Benton. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated to the applicant – Okay, you will be notified when this goes to the City Commission.

Applicants – Thank you.

**Agenda Item #11 – Abandonment – Kings Highway** – Approval to abandon a City right-of-way. Generally located on Kings Highway, north of Okeechobee Road. Owner is Kings Highway Development, LLC, applicant is Mercedes Homes, and representative is Meredith H. Pickens/Shutts & Bowen, LLP.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – This is a 30 ft. wide right-of-way, which bisects a 38-acre parcel. The parcel is intended for comprehensive development, however with the right-of-way running through it, it does render it awkward to develop. And staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – Are there any questions for staff?

Mrs. Brenner stated – I have one. Wendy, could you tell me how long this is? It's 30 ft. wide by what length? And does it have any intrinsic value to the City?

Ms. Clark stated – The length of it is about 1200 linear feet. And sending through all City departments and City agencies, there were no objections to its abandonment.

Mrs. Brenner asked – We can't collect any money from them?

Ms. Clark stated – That would be a City Commission policy.

Mr. Trias added – The answer is yes, you can.

Mrs. Brenner asked – It does have some intrinsic value?

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Trias stated – It have monetary value, it doesn't have any value from the Planning point of view.

Mrs. Brenner – Okay, thanks.

Mr. Bergman asked – Any other questions for staff? We can open the public hearing but there's no public here. Alright, we'll close the public hearing. What's the pleasure of the Board?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPROVE THE ABANDONMENT OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

Mr. Bergman stated – Unless there's objection from Mr. Walker, legal council, I'd like to group items #12 & #13 together, since they're both annexations.

**Agenda Item #12 – Annexation** – Approval to annex properties identified as having a Fort Pierce Utilities Agreement and contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Generally located in the Business Park area.

**Agenda Item #13 – Annexation** – Approval to annex properties identified as having contiguous municipal boundaries of Fort Pierce. Generally located on the S.E. corner of Sunrise Blvd. & Weatherbee Road. Owner is Buccaneer Development.

**Staff Report** – Ms. Clark stated – As general housekeeping, all are contiguous and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bergman asked – And they have a utilities agreement?

Ms. Clark – Right.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT APPROVE THE ANNEXATIONS # 12 & #13. Seconded by Mr. Enns. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

**Agenda Item #14 – Discussions – Term Durations of Board Members** – Research request was made at March's Planning Board meeting regarding the terms of the Board members.

Mr. Bergman asked – Who has the information? Is this staff, or this Mr. Walker, or is this Dianna?

Ms. Clark added – Yeah, I think it was just simply defining the term limits for Board members. So, I don't think there's really any need for discussion unless anyone has any questions.

Ms. Rose stated – I just copied these because it lists on the top a two-year expiration apparently according to the City Clerk's office.

Mr. Bergman stated – I know on the other Boards they're asking for the stagger on term limits...you don't have the whole Board being vacated at one time. And then they were asking about term limits.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Trias added – Mr. Chairman, the idea of term limits was discussed by the City Commission. In my view, it's simply a way of not having to deal with the fact that if they don't want to reappoint someone, they have to say know. Well frankly they have that opportunity and they could exercise that at any point. In my view, there's no need to have any term limits.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well I think that's how the other Boards have viewed it as well. Okay. Ramon, did you have anything you wanted to add?

Mr. Trias – No, sir.

Mrs. Brenner stated – Sir, if you'll read the minutes of last month, we were supposed to elect officers and it was postponed until this month. The last paragraph of the minutes of the last meeting, there was a discussion about who would be nominated, and some people were not present.

Mr. Bergman stated – Oh, that's right....

Mrs. Brenner stated – We thought we give them a chance to jump...

Attorney Walker – Thank you Mrs. Brenner.

Mrs. Brenner – You're welcome.

Mr. Bergman asked – Dianna, did you find out how long I've served? Is my term up?

Ms. Rose stated – Well, your term will up, according to this paperwork I passed out...

Mr. Bergman – Well, not to that...

Ms. Rose added – Well, that's all I have...is February 28, 2006.

Mr. Bergman asked – You don't have any list of...?

Mr. Knott asked – Is there a limitation on how long you can be a chairman or vice chairman?

Mr. Poitier added – It should be in the City's stuff.

Mr. Bergman stated – It's in there. I thought it was a two-year term.

Mr. Poitier added – That's what it says here.

Ms. Rose added – According to this it's two (2) years.

Attorney Walker stated – Mr. Chair, rule 15 of the Board's Rules of Procedure provides "no member may serve more than two (2) full consecutive terms as chair"

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman stated – So, that would be four (4) years?

Mr. Knott stated – He just barely started...that was his first term.

Mr. Bergman stated – Well, that's what I thought.

Mr. Knott stated – I think it was...because Sunny had a couple before that...

Mrs. Gates stated – No, I served two (2) years.

Mr. Knott asked – Oh, you didn't serve the four (4)?

Mrs. Gates stated – Well, in that case...

Mr. Knott stated – I think Don is just finishing his first hitch. Based on that I move that that we nominate Don Bergman as our Chairman and Sunny Gates as our Vice Chairman.

Mrs. Brenner added – And we need a secretary.

Mrs. Gates added – Pam Williams is Secretary.

Mrs. Williams stated – I decline, thank you.

Mrs. Gates asked – You decline?

Mrs. Williams – Yes.

Mrs. Brenner stated – I nominate Jeremiah Johnson.

Mr. Knott stated – I second that.

Mr. Bergman asked – Anyone else want to throw their name in the hat? You know, at some time all of you are going to have to do this.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPOINT DON BERGMAN AS CHAIRMAN, AND SUNNY GATES AS VICE CHAIRMAN. Seconded by Mr. Poitier. Unanimously approved by voice vote.**

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MRS. BRENNER TO APPOINT JEREMIAH JOHNSON AS SECRETARY. Seconded by Mr. Knott. Unanimously approved by voice vote.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Anything else?

Mrs. Brenner stated – We needed to get an excuse for Mr. Harris.

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING HELD APRIL 12, 2005.**

Mr. Bergman asked – Dianna, you did hear from Mr. Harris?

Ms. Rose – Yes, he said if he were to be too late then he would not be here at all.

Mr. Bergman – Okay. What’s the pleasure of the Board with Mr. Harris’ absence?

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. ENNS TO EXCUSE MR. HARRIS’ ABSENCE. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. Unanimously approved by voice vote.**

**Adjourned at 8:40 p.m.**