

**CITY OF FORT MYERS  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY  
MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2022, MEETING**

The Planning Board of the City of Fort Myers, Florida, met in regular session at Oscar M. Corbin, Jr. City Hall, 2200 Second Street, its regular meeting place in the City of Fort Myers, Florida, on Wednesday, April 6, 2022, at 1:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER** – Chair, Matthew Leger, called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Recording Secretary Monique John completed roll call.

Members Present

Matt Leger  
Marcus Collins  
Darlene Mitchell  
James Ink  
Mark Kautz  
Clarisa Parodi  
William Keene

Members Absent

Michael Carlino  
Amy Barnwell

**Community Development Staff Present**

Nicole DeVaughn, Planning and Zoning Manager  
Taryn Thomas, Senior Planner  
Monique John, Senior Staff Assistant

**Other City Staff Present**

Grant Alley, City Attorney  
Anthony Palermo, Assistant Community Development Director  
Steve Belden, Community Development Director  
William Porter, Engineering Division, Staff Engineer

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None

Grant Alley, City Attorney, swore in all witnesses that proposed to speak at the hearing.

**ITEM NO. 1 PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDER A REQUEST TO REZONE 2.39 +/- ACRES LOCATED AT 2401 BAY ST., 2424 EDWARDS DR., AND FOLIO #10162368 FROM URBAN CENTER (U-CTR) TO URBAN CORE (U-CORE). (WARD 4) (QUASI-JUDICIAL)**

**EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** None

Nicole DeVaughn, Planning Manager, Planning Division, Community Development Department, stated that staff findings were as follows:

**BEGIN STAFF REPORT**

**Agenda Item #1: Consider a request to rezone 2.39 +/- acres located at 2401 Bay St., 2424 Edwards Dr., and Folio #10162368 from Urban Center (U-CTR) to Urban Core (U-Core). (Ward 4) (Quasi-Judicial)**

**1. Application Information**

Owner:	2401 Bay Street LLC and The Housing Authority of the City of Fort Myers
Agent:	Jenna Persons, Strayhorn and Persons LLP
Addresses:	2401 Bay Street, 2424 Edwards Drive, & Access Undetermined (Folio #10162368)
Location:	North of Bay Street, east of Lee Street, and south of Edwards Drive.
Size:	2.39 acres, more or less
Folio No.:	10612010, 10612009, & 10162368
Zoning:	Urban Center (U-CTR)
Future Land Use:	Downtown (D/T)
Request:	To rezone a parcel of land from the Urban Center (U-CTR) zoning designation to the Urban Core (U-Core) zoning designation.
Case Number:	RZ22-0012

**2. Request**

Jenna Persons, Strayhorn and Persons, representing 2401 Bay Street LLC and The Housing Authority of the City of Fort Myers, property owners, requests approval for the rezoning of 2401 Bay Street, 2424 Edwards Drive, and Folio #10162368, from Urban Center (U-CTR) zoning designation to the Urban Core (U-Core) zoning designation. A site plan is not required for the rezoning application and is not included.

**3. Comprehensive Plan**

Planning staff reviewed the request and found it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Fire Marshall, and Engineering Division staff reviewed the rezoning request and have no objections or comments.

**Policy 1.7):** Areas on the Future Land Use Map designated as **Downtown (D/T)** are intended for the most intensive development and will be redeveloped as the pre-eminent regional mixed use development center. Properties located within the Downtown Historic District and Dean Park Historic District shall be developed or redeveloped in accordance with this policy and the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The maximum base (not including bonus) density allowed within the D/T District is seventy dwelling units per acre (70du/acre) and the maximum base (not including bonus) intensity for non-residential uses is twelve (12) FAR. The maximum density, intensity and height for each zoning district shall be further regulated by the Land Development Regulations. Additional bonus density, intensity (FAR) and height may be approved in accordance with the bonus allocation program, as described in Policy 1.9 and as implemented through standards and procedures in the Land Development Regulations. Bonus density, intensity and height shall only be approved through the Planned Unit Development process.

Action 1.7.1) Designate on the City's Zoning Map and provide land development regulations for uses appropriate for the redevelopment and revitalization of Downtown Fort Myers and the standards below, with institutional uses such as nonprofit organizations, schools, and churches and related uses allowed in all land use categories except Civic.

Standard 1.7.1.1) The **Urban Core (U-CORE)** zoning designation shall be thoroughly mixed-use or within walking distance of a mixed use Urban Center (standard 1.7.2.2). The Urban Core designation shall allow street level retail or commercial with commercial and residential uses allowed on stories two and above. For the purposes of projecting future growth and demand for services only, the intent of the Urban Core is to provide a ratio of uses as follows: approximate district-wide mix of 60-70% residential and 30-40% nonresidential. These percentages are subject to change as market demands dictate.

Standard 1.7.1.2) The **Urban Center (U-CTR)** zoning designation shall be applied to establish and protect the pedestrian-friendly fabric of the historic downtown core and each surrounding neighborhood. For the purposes of projecting future growth and demand for services only, the intent of the Urban Center is to provide a ratio of uses as follows: approximate district-wide mix of 30-40% residential and 60-70% non-residential. These percentages are subject to change as market demands dictate.

**Minutes - Planning Board**  
**APRIL 6, 2022**

**Policy 3.2)** Special planning and implementation efforts shall be continuously conducted for targeted neighborhoods.

Action 3.2.1) Detailed neighborhood plans or community redevelopment plans shall be prepared and adopted for various neighborhoods throughout the City.

Action 3.2.2) Upon completion of the specific redevelopment plans, special Neighborhood Redevelopment Districts shall be designated on the Fort Myers Redevelopment Areas Map, as amended from time to time on file in the City Clerk's office and implemented through the Land Development Regulations. It is the express intent to promote the redevelopment of areas through special controls, economic incentives, and public as well as private investment.

Action 3.2.3) The following redevelopment, neighborhood, or special plans shall be implemented to the greatest extent feasible:

- 2010 Downtown Plan; Fort Myers Master Plan
- Edison Park Neighborhood Plan;
- Central Fort Myers Area Study;
- Cleveland Avenue Redevelopment Plan;
- Velasco Village Redevelopment Plan;
- Winkler Safe Neighborhood Improvement District Plan;
- Westwood Redevelopment Plan;
- East Fort Myers Revitalization and Redevelopment Plan;
- Urban Infill & Redevelopment Areas, as shown on Map E-1; and,
- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard & Veronica S. Shoemaker Boulevards Revitalization Plan.

**4. Staff Review**

On April 7, 2003, the Downtown Fort Myers plan created by Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company was adopted. This initial vision for the redevelopment of the downtown area led to the creation of new zoning districts, the Smart Code, and established the streetscape design now seen throughout the downtown. The mixed-use Urban Center designation, composed of two- to five- story buildings is the most common zoning district in the downtown, mainly to help protect and continue the pedestrian-friendly fabric of the historic core. The Urban Core zoning designation was assigned to the properties abutting the waterfront east and west of the central downtown area to accommodate taller buildings with higher density and intensities. The parcel located at the intersection of Edwards Drive and Fowler Street was zoned Urban Core to accommodate the height of the existing building.

In 2010, the City Council adopted a revised Downtown Plan prepared by Acquest Realty Advisors along with Parker/Mudgett/Smith Architects, providing development guidelines for properties located north of Bay Street to the river and between the bridges. The revised plan provided guidelines for connecting the waterfront to the historic core by activating Bay Street and Edwards Drive. The first phase of the plan, which has been

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

completed, consisted of the hotel and convention center, as well as the basin water feature.

The subject properties of this staff report are identified as “F1” and “F2” in the adopted plan, which anticipates future development to be two – to four stories in height based on the height restrictions in effect at that time. The allowable height in the Urban Center district was increased after the plan’s adoption and is now 12 stories, which can be increased through the planned unit development process.

The applicant’s request to rezone to Urban Core is consistent with the zoning of the only other development on the block, with the exception of the city park. The Downtown Plan provides specificity for development in certain areas, it should not be treated as an absolute guide to development. As stated in the How to Use this Plan section (pg. I.1), “One thing is certain: they will all change many times over the life of the Downtown Fort Myers. The plan itself should continue to evolve as conditions change and projects are executed.” This proposed rezoning is another new phase in the redevelopment of downtown.

**5. Public Notice**

A total of 128 public notice letters were sent to property owners within 1,000 feet of the parcel. The property was posted with signs alerting the general public about the case; an ad ran in the News-Press; and the case was posted in City Hall. All actions occurred at least 10 days prior to the April 6, 2022, meeting.

**6. Recommended Action**

Recommends approval of the request for rezoning the parcels of land located at 2401 Bay Street, 2424 Edwards Drive, & Access Undetermined (Folio #10162368), consisting of 2.39 acres, more or less, to the Urban Core (U-Core) zoning designation consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code; and recommend approval to City Council.

**END STAFF REPORT**

**PUBLIC INPUT:** None

**DISCUSSION:** None

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Ink to recommend approval for the request for rezoning the parcels of land located at 2401 Bay Street, 2424 Edwards Drive, & Access Undetermined (Folio #10162368), consisting of 2.39 acres, more or less, to the Urban Core (U-Core) zoning designation consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code, seconded by Ms. Mitchell and unanimously approved 7-0.

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

**ITEM NO. 2 PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR BONUS DENSITY TO CONSTRUCT 10 UNITS ON 0.43 ACRES LOCATED AT 2531 AND 2539 SECOND ST. AND FOLIO NO. 10485618. (WARD 4) (QUASI-JUDICIAL)**

**EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:** None

Nicole DeVaughn, Planning Manager, Planning Division, Community Development Department, stated that staff findings were as follows:

**BEGIN STAFF REPORT**

**Agenda Item #2: Consider a request for a planned unit development for bonus density to construct 10 units on 0.43 acres located at 2531 and 2539 Second St. and Folio No. 10485618. (Ward 4) (Quasi-Judicial)**

**1. Application Information**

Owner:	Joseph D Beck II
Agent:	Joseph D Beck II
Addresses:	2531 & 2539 Second Street, & Second Street (Folio #10162368)
Location:	North of Second Street, east of Woodford Avenue, south of First Street, and west of Park Avenue.
Size:	0.43 acres, more or less
Folio No.:	10161885, 10485618, & 10162182
Zoning:	Urban General (U-GEN)
Future Land Use:	Downtown (D/T)
Request:	A Planned Unit Development to increase the allowable density to construct 10 dwelling units.
Case Number:	PUD22-0009

**2. Request**

Joseph Beck, owner, requests approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow bonus density of 24 units per acres on properties located at 2531 & 2539 Second Street, & Second Street (Folio #10162368). The properties are zoned Urban General and are within the Second Street Overlay, which has a base density of 17 units/acre with a maximum bonus density of an additional 40% for parcels one-half acre or less. The proposes a total of 10 dwelling units on the subject properties.

**3. Comprehensive Plan**

Planning staff reviewed the request and found it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

**Policy 1.7):** Areas on the Future Land Use Map designated as **Downtown (D/T)** are intended for the most intensive development and will be redeveloped as the pre-eminent regional mixed use development center. Properties located within the Downtown Historic District and Dean Park Historic District shall be developed or redeveloped in accordance with this policy and the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The maximum base (not including bonus) density allowed within the D/T District is seventy dwelling units per acre (70du/acre) and the maximum base (not including bonus) intensity for non-residential uses is twelve (12) FAR. The maximum density, intensity and height for each zoning district shall be further regulated by the Land Development Regulations. Additional bonus density, intensity (FAR) and height may be approved in accordance with the bonus allocation program, as described in Policy 1.9 and as implemented through standards and procedures in the Land Development Regulations. Bonus density, intensity and height shall only be approved through the Planned Unit Development process.

Action 1.7.1) Designate on the City's Zoning Map and provide land development regulations for uses appropriate for the redevelopment and revitalization of Downtown Fort Myers and the standards below, with institutional uses such as nonprofit organizations, schools, and churches and related uses allowed in all land use categories except Civic.

Standard 1.7.1.3) The Urban General (U-GEN) zoning designation shall be primarily residential and more urban in character. These areas shall encourage compatible infill and encourage live/work units and limited mixed-use. For the purposes of projecting future growth and demand for services, the intent of the Urban General is to provide a ratio of uses as follows: approximate district-wide mix of 80-90% residential and 10-20% non-residential. These percentages are subject to change as market demands dictate.

**4. Staff Review**

The Fire Marshall, Public Works Department and Engineering Division staff reviewed the PUD Application and after three rounds of review have no objections.

**5. Public Notice**

A total of 161 public notice letters were sent to property owners within 1,000 feet of the parcel. The property was posted with signs alerting the general public about the case; and the ad ran in the News-Press. All actions occurred at least 10 days prior to the April 6, 2022, meeting.

**6. Warrants and Deviations**

1. Land Development Code Section 118.8.5.B.1.b Urban General Zoning District Regulations, Setbacks – Front setback: 15 foot minimum, 25 foot maximum. Side setback: 5 foot minimum, 30 foot maximum. Rear setback: 10 feet.

**Warrant:** Side setback 4 feet 4 inches (4'-4") minimum.

2. Land Development Code Section 118.8.5.B.4.a. Urban General Zoning District Regulations, Parking standards – All parking areas shall be located within the second and third layers and masked by a streetwall or liner building.

**Warrant:** Allow driveways and garage parking within the first and second layer.

3. Land Development Code Section 118.8.5.B.5.a. Urban General Zoning District Regulations, Architectural standards – The exterior finish materials on all facades shall be limited to brick, wood, hardiplank, tile, terracotta, stucco, or similar materials.

**Warrant:** Allow metal as a finish material on facades.

**7. Conditions**

Staff finds the proposed amendments to the Edsel Lofts Unit Development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Code, and recommends approval of the PUD amendment to the Planning Board, subject to the following:

- a. This planned unit development is for the construction of a maximum of 24 dwelling units per acre for a total of 10 dwelling units.
- b. The Edsel Lofts PUD is subject to the following Smart Code conditions:
  1. **Pedestrian Friendly Connection** – The developer will provide pedestrian access between the project and public right-of-way with a minimum width of six feet for access to the sidewalk/street frontage. The developer will build and maintain improvements at its expense. Developer must agree to continue the adopted streetscape plan on the first layer of the property and to maintain consistency with the plan in perpetuity.
  2. **Community Contribution fees** – The developer shall pay a community contribution fee in the amount of \$10,000 per approved bonus dwelling unit. If approved at 24 dwelling units per acre, the community contribution fee would be \$30,000 due prior to the

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

issuance of the building permit for vertical. No public gathering space is proposed to offset the community contribution fee.

- c. Support the warrants and deviations as shown on the site plans prepared by Captain's Design & Charters. The applicant shall comply with all other requirements of the Smart Code and Land Development Code.
- d. An additional traffic impact study will be required if the land uses, or combination of land uses change.
- e. This development shall be completed as shown on the site plans and architectural elevations prepared by Captain's Design and Charters, dated of February 7, 2022.
- f. Construction permits must be applied for within five (5) years from the date of the Planned Unit Development approval and construction completed within five (5) years. If for any reason, the Developer is not able to meet the timeframes set forth above, the Developer must, no later than ninety (90) days prior to expiration of any of the timeframes set forth above, provide written notice to the City indicating its anticipated failure to meet the timeframes and provide a detailed explanation of the reason. The City shall determine whether an extension of the timeframes is warranted.

**8. Recommended Action**

Find the Edsel Lofts Planned Unit Development, as conditioned, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code; and recommend approval to City Council.

**END STAFF REPORT**

**PUBLIC INPUT:** J.J Cochrane, city resident, stated she did not feel that the applicant's request was reasonable, and that the architecture was not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Ms. Cochran also stated that she had concerns about the water retention and the parking and would like to hear more from the applicant on the two subjects.

Debra Hughes, city resident, stated that the homes in the district were much older and that the proposed type of construction was not consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Hughes stated that the construction was beautiful but not for the neighborhood that it was proposed to be in and felt that it was more to make money for the applicant.

Jacqueline Byrnes, city resident, stated her home was right next to the proposed property. Ms. Byrnes stated that she agreed with all the prior concerns stated and also that she felt the lot was way too small for the proposed construction. Ms. Byrnes stated that the proposed construction was not in accordance with anything in the neighborhood and would make a drastic change to the neighborhood.

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

Bill Byrnes, city resident, stated that none of the residents were in opposition to development but were in opposition to the proposed construction as it was not consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Byrnes stated that the proposed construction would hinder the natural sunlight that came into his home on the South side until very late in the evening as all his windows were located on that side. Mr. Byrnes stated that he was concerned about stormwater draining and possibly flooding other properties in the neighborhood. Mr. Byrnes stated that he did not see any HVAC units on the applicants plans. Mr. Byrnes also stated that he was very concerned about the applicant building in phases instead of doing the construction all at once and that the proposed construction was too much for the size of the property.

Charles Taylor, city resident, stated that he was very much in favor of the proposed construction and that he felt that the area needed reinvigorating and the construction fit in with the plan of the City of Fort Myers for construction in the downtown area. Mr. Taylor noted that the City of Fort Myers had plans on developing second street with a mixture of artisan and historic architecture therefore the proposed construction fit. Mr. Taylor encouraged greater, denser, and more modern architecture mixed in with the historic architecture in the area.

Cherll Logan, neighborhood resident, stated she was completely against the request for the proposed construction. Ms. Logan stated that she was new in the neighborhood and had paid almost \$500,000 for her home and had purchased her backyard separately from her home which was north of one of the proposed buildings. Ms. Logan stated that on the site plans one of the buildings were proposed to be on the 20-foot easement on Woodford alley which contained her deeded 10-foot easement which allowed her access to her backyard. Ms. Logan stated that she had just installed a new fence and that the applicant had his mailboxes on her easement. Ms. Logan expressed significant disapproval of the request and stated that the proposed construction was not consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Logan stated that her property was going to be directly affected by the request and asked that the board to deny the request.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Ink asked staff to elaborate on the warrants and why staff was in support of them such as reducing the setback. Ms. DeVaughn stated that the applicant was providing the full setback off the street frontages, providing an additional sidewalk, pushing the building closer to the side property lines, and also because it was only a half of foot difference that was being requested for the reduced setback. Mr. Ink stated that granting the reduced setback would allow changes to the property to the North on the other side of the property line and stated that according to the code the setback was supposed to be five feet.

Mr. Ink asked what the applicant had done to warrant a setback deviation. Ms. DeVaughn advised that the applicant was providing a wider sidewalk which was eight feet, and also that the sidewalk would enhance the pedestrian experience along Second Street, providing easier access to future commercial development along Second Street.

Mr. Ink questioned the deviation for the parking that was being requested by the applicant. Ms. DeVaughn advised that almost every Planned Unit Development (PUD) in

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

the downtown area had the same type of deviation attached. Ms. DeVaughn further stated that most of the parking would be in garages instead of a surface parking lot.

Mr. Ink questioned the proposed finishes on the building and the justification of allowing the applicant to use metal material. Ms. DeVaughn advised that staff felt that one of the key elements of the downtown plans was architectural excellence and that it was more of a form-based code than a rigid suburban code. Ms. DeVaughn stated that throughout the history of the code there was the ability to be flexible with the creativity of architecture within these certain requests and also that the differentiation of historic architecture and new construction was encouraged. Mr. Ink asked why metal material was not included in the original code. Ms. DeVaughn advised that it was one of the components in the original Smart Code provided by Duane Plater-Zyberk in 2002. Ms. DeVaughn stated that there would need to be a change to the site plans as the mailboxes would need to be moved and also noted for the record that the 10-foot easement referred to by Ms. Logan was shown on the applicants site plans.

Mr. Ink asked if front garage doors were permitted. Ms. DeVaughn advised that they were permitted if the warrant was granted by the board. Mr. Ink asked which warrant the front garage doors fell under. Ms. DeVaughn stated they fell under the parking in the first- and second-layer warrant. Mr. Ink asked if the construction was under a single unified owner. Ms. DeVaughn stated that the three lots were under common ownership. Mr. Ink asked if the lots could be platted. Ms. DeVaughn advised that they could not be platted with the way the plans were drawn and that all new platted lots must have the required frontage on a platted and improved right of way.

Mr. Ink asked if the six-foot minimum setback between the two buildings needed to meet the rear setback for both lots. Ms. DeVaughn advised that would become a building code issue as they could not be platted. Mr. Ink asked If the property was a rental property. Ms. DeVaughn advised that the property would be a multifamily project and did not know if it would be a rental project.

Mr. Ink asked if landscape standards had to be met. Ms. DeVaughn advised that there were no landscaping standards for the downtown area and that downtown was expressly exempt from the vegetation chapter.

Ms. Parodi stated that from looking at the applicants site plans, that some of the guest parking appeared to be on resident Cherll Logan's easement property and asked how that would be addressed.

Joe Beck, applicant, stated that he had a conversation with Ms. Logan requesting her to abandon her 10-foot easement and be able to have access to the bigger 20-foot easement which would give her a greater paved property that she could travel across, but that he had no legal entity in order to make the agreement with her.

Ms. Parodi stated that the applicant needed to have a private agreement with property owner Cherll Logan to abandon her easement in order for his property to be built the way he was proposing.

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

Mr. Beck stated there was intention to propose an agreement to Ms. Logan but that he still needed to get legal representation first.

Ms. Parodi stated that she did not feel comfortable making a decision on the request without an agreement between the applicant and Ms. Logan about her 10-foot easement property because the board would also be making a decision about someone else's property.

The board agreed with Ms. Parodi.

Mr. Beck proposed reducing the number of units from ten units to nine units in order to dedicate one of the units only to parking.

Mr. Leger advised that would require revised site plans.

Mr. Beck advised that he was a registered architect and could amend his site plans during the meeting for the board.

Mr. Keene stated that the site plan submitted had eight proposed warrants on it but that the staff report only showed three proposed warrants.

Mr. Beck stated that he had submitted eight warrants but that if staff was only recommending three of the warrants, he had no objections.

Ms. DeVaughn advised the applicant that he had submitted two different site plans with different amounts of warrants and that staff used the most recent site plan submitted.

Mr. Ink stated that the site plan needed to be revised to include all warrants being requested.

Ms. Parodi stated that on the site plan there were lines labeled as parcel lines.

Mr. Beck stated that his intent was to create a Homeowners Association that had parcel lines and not a condo association.

Mr. Ink asked if the applicant was selling the units.

Mr. Beck advised that he intended to sell the units.

Ms. DeVaughn advised the applicant that a Homeowners Association did not create lot lines and only a subdivision plat created lot lines, therefore he would have to do a condominium plat with an association.

Mr. Beck asked the board for a continuance on his request so that he may address all the concerns by the board.

Mr. Ink asked Mr. Alley if the board could postpone the agenda request for 30 days.

**Minutes - Planning Board  
APRIL 6, 2022**

Mr. Alley advised that the board could postpone to a date and time certain, make a decision to make a recommendation to City Council based on the information provided, or the applicant could withdraw his application and come back before the board.

Mr. Ink asked the applicant how much time was needed to revise his plans.

Mr. Beck advised he could have all of his revisions and requirements by the next Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Keene asked the applicant what his plan was for water management on the property.

Mr. Beck stated that each of the units would have a 60-gallon rain barrel and also have a low-pressure irrigation plan.

Mr. Ink noted that would not meet state requirements.

Mr. Keene stated that a 25-year stormwater system needed to be installed as it was a major concern that would be considered in making a decision on the request.

Ms. Parodi clarified that the board did not require to see a water management plan but the fact that the density was a concern, the water management plan needed to be reviewed as it could offer resolutions to other issues with the request.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mr. Ink to table the item until the May 4, 2022, meeting, seconded by Ms. Parodi, and unanimously approved 7-0.

**PUBLIC INPUT – NON-PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA ITEMS:** Mr. Ink asked if there was any update from staff on the Midtown plan progress. Mr. Leger stated that at the City Council workshop there were discussion of different plan possibilities but that ultimately there had not been any conceptual plans made as of yet. Ms. DeVaughn advised that staff had not received any more information as of yet on any plans for Midtown.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Hearing no other business the meeting adjourned the meeting at 2:12 p.m.