

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting December 3, 2019

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at 2:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Karen Zander, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call: Karen Zander, Chairperson
Jon DePreter, Vice Chairperson
Grant Misterly
Sarah Ryan
Mike Davis

Absent: Christina Opsahl

City Staff: David Birchim, Director, Planning & Building Department
Patrick Doty, Senior Development Review Planner
John Cary, Assistant City Attorney
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary

Modifications to the Agenda

Ms. Zander announced a request to move item 5(a) to a later portion of the meeting made by a member of the public that wished to speak on the subject.

Jim Wilson, representing the person who made the request, clarified that the change was no longer necessary.

Ms. Zander announced a request by the applicant to continue item 5(b) to the February 4, 2020 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to CONTINUE application 2019-0086 to the February 4, 2020 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Misterly.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Misterly, Davis, Ryan, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Doty advised a request to continue item 8(a) to January 7, 2020 due to changes in the application.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to CONTINUE application 2019-0115 to the January 7, 2020 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Davis, Ryan, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

The Board heard from the following member of the public:

- Ed Slavin

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Cary noted a small error in the list of staff present, adding that he had informed the recording secretary of the issue prior to the meeting.

MOTION

Ms. Ryan MOVED to APPROVE the November 5, 2019 minutes as revised. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Zander and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Variance

4. (a) 2019-0102 – James Solana – Applicant Sisters of St. Joseph – Owner 243 St. George Street

Ms. Zander recused herself from the application.¹

Mr. Davis clarified that he had done work with the applicant in the past but his work was unrelated to the application and he did not have to recuse himself.

To exceed the maximum lot coverage for construction of a 705 square foot addition to the existing residential facility.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 28-29 and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board may be able to **APPROVE** a Variance to add a 705 square foot addition to the main building at **243 St. George Street.**

James Solana reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

¹ Form attached to original minutes.

60 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Ed Slavin spoke in favor of the application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed that the application met the variance criteria as detailed in the staff report.

MOTION

Ms. Ryan MOVED to APPROVE application 2019-0102 as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Misterly.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ryan, Misterly, Davis, DePreter

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. (b) 2019-0120 – Quinn M. Robert – Applicant and Owner 14 Avista Circle

To exceed the maximum lot coverage for construction of an 811 square foot addition to the existing single-family home and a 545 square foot covered carport.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 28-29 and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board may be able to **DENY** a Variance to exceed the maximum lot coverage in RS-1 zoning district for the construction of an 811 square foot addition to the existing single-family home and a 545 square foot covered carport at **14 Avista Circle/PIN 214520-0000.**

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

10 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, and 3 had comments.

Quinn Robert reviewed the application with an additional list of neighbors in support of the application.²

The Board discussed:

- Finished floor elevation was 7.74 feet and the applicant intended to lift the interior floor to approximately 8.3 feet
- Lack of a singular disadvantage as the applicant had other, conforming options to meet his intent
- Variance could allow future property owners to build up to 33% lot coverage at any allowed height

Public hearing was opened.

Ed Slavin spoke in favor of the application due to his support of aging-in-place accommodations and the applicant's consideration of surrounding property owners in not building above the existing home in larger scale.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board continued discussion regarding the following:

- Size of the existing house was approximately 1,250 square feet
- Clarification of the square footage being added, which included a footprint of 1,700 square foot
- Application did not meet variance criteria in part because the property was a conforming lot
- Applicant had an additional square footage available to add to the existing structure without needing a variance
- Applicant was willing to remove proposed car port from the application as well as additional covered areas included for aesthetics

- Possibility of approving a 28% variance for addition to the home without the carport
- Keeping neighborhood scale and not building over neighboring houses
- Aging-in-place hardship was not within code criteria

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to DENY application 2019-0120 because there was no singular disadvantage to the property and there was still reasonable use on the property as there were 360 square feet still available and the potential for a second story. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Zander.

Mr. Misterly explained that applications needed to meet all four criteria to be approved, and criteria number two: Because of the disadvantage the owner is not able to make reasonable use of the effected property," was not met.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Zander, Ryan, Misterly

NAYES: Davis

MOTION CARRIED 4/1

5. Conservation Overlay Zone Development

5. (a) 2019-0101 – Ryan Carter, Carter Environmental Services, Inc. – Applicant Ernest Little – Owner 5 Lighthouse Avenue

To approve dock modifications to an existing two hundred twenty nine (229') foot dock including and a three (3') foot by eighteen (18') foot gangway that connects the existing dock to a ten (10') foot by twenty (20') foot floating platform within Conservation Overlay Zone 1.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 11-29 and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can

² Attached to original minutes

APPROVE the construction of a floating dock platform. Gangway, and four (4) associated piling in Conservation Overlay Zone 1 located at **5 Lighthouse Avenue/PIN: 157040-0000**. Mr. Doty added that, in light of new information provided by the applicant which shows that the dock was located within the City's mooring field, and the PZB approval with a condition that the dock should not infringe on the adjacent mooring field, staff deferred to the PZB their recommendation for approval or denial.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application with additional information regarding the location of the dock which was built in a different alignment than what was approved.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

26 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 3 had comments.

The Board discussed the following:

- Concern for the dock being constructed within the mooring field
- City request that the property owner rent the mooring ball from the City if the dock remained close to the mooring ball

John Goebler, the contractor who constructed the dock, spoke regarding the construction of the dock without a City building permit and in the wrong location. He described the difficulty in moving the dock.

Board discussion continued regarding the following:

- Clarification of the dock within the mooring field
- Illustration provided by the applicant showing that neighboring property's riparian rights were not affected

- City staff and Board did not have authority over riparian rights
- Possibility of shortening the dock out of the mooring field
- DEP and Army Corps permits were for the previously approved alignment

Public hearing was opened.

Jim Wilson, attorney representing Tom and Pilar Hartman who were not in favor of the application, requested that the floating dock be placed on the north side of the property if not denied. He spoke against the application on behalf of his client based upon the new evidence that the dock was in the wrong location and without a building permit

Charles Pappas noted that the dock was built incorrectly. He reminded the Board of the previous concerns regarding the mooring fields. He felt this was an issue between the property owner and the contractor to move the dock to the approved location before considering the remainder of the application for the gangway and floating platform.

Ed Slavin spoke against the application and believed that case law would support the demolition of the existing dock.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Carter addressed public comments made regarding incorrect construction of the dock which was discovered only recently.

The Board discussed:

- Contractor should be responsible for the wrong alignment of the dock
- Steps the applicant would have to take if the Board were to deny the application
- The Board did not have the authority to request removal of the dock

- Concern that misalignment of the dock was not part of the advertised application for approval and the application could be challenged if approved
- Location of the dock within the mooring field made the application difficult to approve based upon City Code
- Options for the property owner moving forward including:
 - Shortening the dock so it was no longer within the mooring field
 - Flipping the floating dock to the north side
- Clarification that the previous approval included a condition that the dock did not interfere with the mooring field

Earnest Little, property owner, gave a brief history of the property. He added that he was not fully aware of his riparian rights in relation to the City mooring field and clarified that the proposed length of the dock was based upon the need to reach navigable water. He said he had agreed to rental of the mooring ball as a possible solution to the issue.

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of continuing the application to allow the applicant time to consider other options for the dock.

Clarification regarding the mooring ball radius as illustrated by the applicant in the first application and the mooring field which was marked with channel markers.

Mr. Carter reiterated the importance of the dock length in reaching sufficient water depth.

MOTION

Mr. Misterly MOVED to DENY
Conservation Overlay Zone 1

Development application 2019-0101. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Zander.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Misterly, Zander, Davis, Ryan, DePreter

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

5. (b) 2019-0086 – Scott Patrou, Ginn & Patrou Holdings, LLC – Applicant and Owner
435 Flagler Boulevard

To approve the construction of a four hundred sixty-five foot (465') long dock with three (3) associated boat lifts and a bulkhead within Conservation Overlay Zone 1. To approve the construction of three (3) condominium units in Conservation Overlay Zone 2.

Applicant requested a continuance to the February 4, 2020 meeting. See motion to continue under Modifications to the Agenda.

5. (c) 2019-0118 – Cora Johnston, Generation Homes – Applicant
Anthony & Kathleen Prestera – Owner
111 Fiddler Crab Lane

To approve the removal of three (3) significant trees (Southern Red Cedars) within Conservation Overlay Zone 3.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 11-29, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can **APPROVE** removal of the trees at the subject property including three (3) significant trees (southern red cedars) within Conservation Overlay Zone 3 located at **111 Fiddler Crab Lane/PIN 158571-9090**. Mr. Doty noted that two of the three trees were dead as noted in the arborist report.

Cora Johnston reviewed the application.

³ Brief recess from 4:02p.m. to 4:16p.m.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

9 certified notices were sent, and 1 was returned in favor.

The Board discussed:

- The condition requiring ten southern red cedar trees on the property after construction of the home
- The living tree proposed for removal had a severe lean

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to APPROVE application 2019-0118. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. DePreter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, DePreter, Ryan, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (d) 2019-0117 – Herbert Vandermark, Yelton Construction Co., Inc. – Applicant Kenton Morrison – Owner 25 Dolphin Drive

To approve the construction of a ten foot (10') by twenty foot (20') terminal platform with two (2) associated boat lifts within Conservation Overlay Zone 1.

Mr. Davis recused himself as he worked for the current property owner.⁴

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 11-29, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can **APPROVE** the construction of a terminal platform and two (2) associated boat lifts in

Conservation Overlay Zone 1 located at **25 Dolphin Drive/PIN: 220070-0000.**

Taylor Yelton was available for questions.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

26 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor.

The Board discussed:

- Modification to an existing dock to add boatlifts
- Proposed dock was landward of existing dock
- Existing dock protruded more north than the proposed dock
- Proposed dock was wider and closer to the riparian lines but applicant said it maintained the proper setback
- Existing floating dock was badly damaged

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to APPROVE Conservation Overlay Zone Development application 2019-0117 because, as noted in the staff report, it already received approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Florida DEP and it meets all the criteria for Overlay Development. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Ryan

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Ryan, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

⁴ Form attached to original minutes

6. Use by Exception

6. (a) 2019-0114 – Vallery Clouse – Applicant and Owner 166 Marine Street

To approve a home occupation for cranial sacral & lymphatic massage.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 28-29 and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can **APPROVE** a home occupation as a permitted use by exception for cranial sacral and lymphatic massage at **166 Marine Street/PIN 201180-0000**.

Vallery Clouse was present for questions.

The Board discussed:

- Three units on the property, one room and one restroom in apartment A would be utilized
- Parking requirements were computed by square footage
- Ensuring parking requirements were met for the entire tri-plex
- Desire to see a site-plan with parking

Ex Parte Communication:

37 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 7 returned opposed and 6 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Blanch Judd was concerned about parking and congestion on the street. She felt that if it was only one customer at a time the business could be acceptable.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Clouse stated that she felt confident her clients would be able to park in the existing driveway.

The Board discussed:

- Determining whether the property was utilized as a tri-plex to determine proper parking requirements
- Low intensity of the proposed use
- Possibility of approving a use by exception with terms that if the business received three or more founded complaints within a year, the applicant would have to come before the Board again for review

MOTION

Mr. Misterly MOVED to APPROVE Use By Exception application 2019-0114 with the following conditions:

1. City Staff evaluate the use of the property (whether it is single, family, duplex, or tri-plex) and assess the required parking; and, if it meets the required parking, then the application can be approved
2. If there are three code enforcement complaints within the next year, then the applicant must return before the Board for review

The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Ryan

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Misterly, Ryan, Davis, DePreter

NAYES: Zander

MOTION CARRIED 4/1

7. Use by Exception & Conservation Overlay Zone Development

7. (a) 2019-0116 – Shannon Acevedo, Matthews Design Group – Applicant Windward Marina St. Augustine South, LLC – Owner 400 & 404 Riberia Street

To approve a use by exception for a restaurant. To approve for the construction of a replacement twelve foot (12') by fourteen hundred foot (1400') dock, placement of riprap, shoreline stabilization, performance of maintenance dredging, and wetland mitigation within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 & 2.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and said the following:

- Based on a review of Section 28-29, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can **APPROVE** the use by exception for a restaurant at **404 Riberia Street**.
- Based on a review of Section 11-29, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can **APPROVE** the construction of a replacement twelve foot (12') by fourteen hundred foot (1400') dock, placement of riprap, placement of a bulkhead, shoreline stabilization, performance of maintenance dredging, and wetland mitigation, with a condition of 1 for 1 replacement of all wetland impacts, within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 and the proposed restaurant within Conservation Overlay Zone 2 located at **400 and 404 Riberia Street**.

Shannon Acevedo reviewed the application regarding the use by exception with a presentation.⁵

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

49 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 1 had comments.

⁵ Attached to original minutes

The Board discussed the following regarding the use by exception:

- Development would create 81% impervious surface
- Possible upgrades and connectivity to Riberia Street
- Seating arrangements
- Possibility of acoustic music
- Parking calculations
- Liquor licensing
- Open-air seating area

Stefan Johansson gave a brief history of the property, his purchase of the property, and his vision for the uses on the property moving forward.

Ms. Acevedo reviewed the number of seats on the site plan, noting that the seating under the pavilion was over one hundred and fifty (150) seats.

Steve Mask, in response to comments from the Board and a statement published in the St. Augustine Record, noted that the proposed restaurant would allow docking space for a food truck, enabling the restaurant to serve multiple styles of food with the additional commissary area to support food service.

The Board continued discussion regarding:

- Doubt in the accuracy of the traffic study, particularly in pedestrian estimates
- Consideration of all property uses for parking calculations
- Concern for the full liquor license in an area where alcohol had not been previously served
- Restaurant as an ancillary use in other, similar zoning categories
- Concern for the intensity of the use, particularly traffic impacts affecting the residential atmosphere of the neighborhood

and potential lighting and noise impacts which should be mitigated

Paulina Johansson spoke regarding lighting and sound concerns stating that they were passionate about minimizing light pollution in the area and the noise level of the restaurant would not surpass the industrial warehouse machinery which was operational during the day.

Public hearing was opened.

Barbara Brottman was concerned that the proposed restaurant would utilize the public parking across the street from her house. She was also concerned about future growth of the restaurant.

Lauren Giber spoke against the application citing concerns with traffic, which was already congested and prone to speeders.

Charles Pappas thought the project was unique. He felt that the project would improve that area and integrate with future means to create a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly environment. He added that the inclusion of the liquor license was reasonable to cater to all tastes. He noted that there was a processing plant proposed on the property and asked that the applicant clarify that use.

James Whitehouse testified that the applicant, whom he was representing on the Shipyards project, had been working towards improving mobility in the City. He understood concerns of impacting the surrounding neighborhood but noted that there were large buffers between the neighborhood and the project site. He added that there was enough acreage to provide all the parking required.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Johansson noted that the processing plant, which was a permitted use on the property, would be a sustainable fishing operation where fresh fish would be

prepared for sale. He added that he would be happy to allow only non-amplified music. He stated that the property was 31 acres and they had ability to provide ample parking. He re-stated that they would do everything possible to limit or eliminate light pollution.

The Board discussed:

- Separating the Customs and Border Patrol secure area from the proposed public space with fencing and gates
- Uses by exception were to control density of certain uses
- History of the surrounding area and its former, potentially more-intense, uses
- Additional intensity would have to return before the Board
- Adding conditions to the approval, including:
 - Minimizing light pollution by requiring lights to not be directed toward residential areas and utilization of lower lumen lights
 - Encouraging use of impervious pavers
 - Hours of operation no later than 11:00p.m.
 - Encouragement of multi-modal connections

Mr. Johansson was amenable to 11:00 pm closing time.

There was a brief discussion regarding how the mobility fee would affect the applicant during development.

MOTION

Mr. Misterly MOVED to APPROVE Use by Exception application 2019-0116 with the following conditions:

- No amplified music

- **Lighting be low-lumen down light with no lights directed towards the residential neighborhood**
- **That the restaurant and bar closes by 11:00p.m.**

The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Ryan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Misterly, Ryan, Davis, DePreter

NAYES: Zander

MOTION CARRIED 4/1

Ryan Carter continued the presentation and reviewed the application regarding Conservation Overlay Zone Development.

The Board discussed:

- Use for extended dock as a place to stage boats and boat parking for the restaurant
- Possible **FIND** restrictions in regards to the San Sebastian channel
- Wetlands mitigation as proposed did not meet City requirement of one to one replacement because there were still some wetlands function to the open water being dredged
- Possibility of allowing off-site wetlands mitigation within the San Sebastian watershed to meet City requirements
- Concern for proposed dock blocking wetlands access to the public
- Proposed capacity of dock would be approximately 40 boats
- Water taxi was intended to be along the proposed dock
- Need for added dockage space in the city
- Ensure parking was created for the water taxi and dock uses
- No long-term docking was intended
- Encouragement of working waterfront uses over marina uses

Public comment was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Davis **MOVED** to **APPROVE** Conservation Overlay Zone Development application 2019-0116 to approve the construction of a replacement twelve foot (12') by fourteen hundred foot (1,400') dock, placement of riprap, shoreline stabilization, performance of maintenance dredging, and wetland mitigation within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 & 2 with the condition that the wetlands replacement meet the City Code requirements. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. DePreter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, DePreter, Ryan, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Rezoning

8. (a) 2019-0115 – Paul Harden – Applicant
John Wilson, West Sebastian, LLC – Owner
San Sebastian View – PID #: 084560-, 102990, 102810-, 154860-, and 155540-0000

To A request to Rezone Flagler Crossing PUD (Ord. 2013-18) to Residential, General-One (RG-1).

Applicant requested a continuance prior to the meeting. See Modifications to the agenda for motion to continue.

**8. (b) 2019-0119 – James Whitehouse, St. Johns Law Group – Applicant
Columbia Restaurant of St. Augustine, LLC – Owner
98 St. George Street**

To request to amend PUD 2011-03 to allow for additional 312 square feet of lot coverage.

Mr. Doty read the staff report and advised that staff did not make recommendations concerning the rezoning of land.

Mr. Whitehouse reviewed the application.

There was discussion regarding the smaller square footage of the proposed walk-in cooler versus the requested amount of square footage which was meant to provide the owner of the property some leeway and avoid having to re-apply for similar minor modifications to the PUD.

There was Board consensus to reduce the lot coverage from 28% to 27% to allow some additional square footage for the applicant if necessary.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

27 certified notices were sent, 2 returned opposed, and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of application 2019-0119 to the City Commission because it met the purpose of the PUD; and, with the condition that the allowed lot coverage be 27%. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Davis, Ryan, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Other Business

9. (a) Discussion and Recommendation of Ordinance 2019-34, zoning requirements for Tattoo Studios and Micropigmentation

Mr. Cary reviewed the ordinance.

Mr. Cary clarified that micropigmentation was restricted in more zoning categories than tattoos were because micropigmentation was not protected under the First Amendment as a form of artistic expression the way tattoos were. He added that there needed to be strong public health and safety concerns to regulate tattoos, and the HP districts, with limited or no on-site parking, posed such concerns when regarding the safe removal and disposal of tattoo needles.

Public comment was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the Ordinance 2019-34 for tattoo studios and micropigmentation to the City Commission. The motion was SECONDED Ms. Ryan.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: DePreter, Ryan, Davis, Misterly, Zander

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (b) Discussion and Recommendation of Ordinance 2019-53, to codify and provide guidance for establishing a city tree mitigation fund within chapter 25, section 25-56 of City Code

Mr. Cary reviewed the ordinance.

Ms. Zander recommended that section 25-56 language be tightened to clarify that tree mitigation locations were to be determined by the City.

Public comment was opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Ordinance 2019-53 to codify and provide guidance for establishing a city tree mitigation fund within Chapter 25, Section 25-56 of City Code as amended by the Chair to the City Commission. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Zander.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Davis, Zander, Ryan, Misterly, DePreter

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Board Comments

Ms. Zander asked that the Board require title blocks for submittals provided by professional architects, engineers, landscape architects, etc. to ensure there were no conflicts of interest. There was a brief discussion regarding the information that should be required in the title block and the difficulties staff may face in trying to enforce such a requirement.

There was Board consensus to revisit the subject during a subsequent meeting, with Ms. Zander dissenting.

10. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Zander adjourned the meeting at 7:42 P.M.⁶



Karen Zander, Chairperson

⁶ Transcribed by Candice Seymour