CITY OF COCOA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
July 17, 2018

A Special meeting of the Planning & Zoning Board of the City of Cocoa was held on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 in the Council Chambers at 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, as publicly noticed.

**OPENING MATTERS:**

Chairman Mike Dobrin called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M. The Board Secretary called the roll.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| Michael Dobrin | Chairman |
| Aleck Greenwood | Board Member |
| Jack Moore | Board Member |
| Jake Williams | Board Member |
| Lawrence Koss | Board Member (arrived at 6:03pm) |
| Sherry Ervin | Board Member |
| Russell Sengel | Board Member |
| Marilyn Green | Alternate Member |

MEMBERS ABSENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| Al Washington | Vice Chairman |
| Todd Anderson | Board Member |

OTHERS PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| Dodie Selig | Planning & Zoning Manager |
| Robert Loring | Planner |
| Karen Hamilton | Community Services Director |
| Kristin Eick | Board Attorney |
| Jeri Blanco | Board Liaison |
| Monica Arsenault | Board Secretary |

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES:**

1. Approval of Agenda: July 17, 2018.

   Motion by Jake Williams, seconded by Jack Moore, to approve the agenda of July 17, 2018. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes: March 14, 2018.

   Motion by Jack Moore, seconded by Sherry Ervin, to approve the minutes of March 14, 2018 as written. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

   Ms. Selig introduced Mr. Robert Loring, the City's new Planner.

Chairman Dobrin announced that pending the approval of the City Council, City Council meeting nights will be changed from Tuesday nights to Wednesday nights. Ms. Arsenault polled the Board members to determine their availability in the event that meeting nights will need to be changed. Board members agreed that either Tuesday evenings or the first Wednesday of the month would be suitable.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

A. Tree Board Discussion – Tabled to Next Meeting
B. Parking on Gravel – Tabled to Next Meeting

Board member Greenwood inquired about a time certain to discuss these items. He stated a concern regarding trees that are pending removal and he reminded everyone about the tree ordinance.

Chairman Dobrin asked who makes the decision to remove the trees. In response, Ms. Selig explained that Public Works makes the decision. She noted that in these instances the cases are brought before Council for approval.

Board member Koss inquired if the City's arborist was involved. In response, Ms. Selig answered affirmatively.

Chairman Dobrin asked that these items not be tabled again.

Ms. Hamilton pointed out that there is a mention in the Ordinance that in certain instances trees may be removed if there is an emergency such as public heath, safety and welfare. In such cases the Board would be notified following the removal.

Board member Greenwood agreed with Ms. Hamilton's statement but encouraged staff to do their best to honor the Ordinance and to notify the Board as soon as possible.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. PZ-18-02000001 – Zoning Text Amendment (Non-conforming lots of record)**

Ordinance No. 05-2018

An ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, Brevard County, Florida; amending Appendix A, Article X, Section 3 of the Code of the City of Cocoa to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record; providing for the repeal of prior inconsistent ordinances and resolutions, incorporation into the code, severability, and an effective date.

Ms. Selig pointed out that the City is the applicant and explained that the requested action is to approve Ordinance No. 05-2018 which would amend Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3 of the City Code, in order to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record.

She explained that when making amendments to the Code, staff considers the need and justification for the change as well as how the amendment relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Selig reported that the City has identified an area of the City Code, specifically Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3, related to non-conforming lots of record which should be clarified. The intent of this section is to ensure that property owners maintain reasonable use of their lots if they become nonconforming lots due to a change in the Zoning Ordinance of the City. Furthermore, the City currently allows, in any district in which single-family dwellings are permitted, a single-family dwelling and customary accessory buildings to be erected on the nonconforming lot of record, provided that yard dimensions and requirements other than area and width are satisfied.

Ms. Selig noted that the key is that the language does not include any mention of depth in the Ordinance as it stands currently. Therefore, if a lot meets the width as well as the area but it does not meet the depth, a variance may be required.

She explained that after discussing this with Council, staff has brought this ordinance to the Board for the clarifications to be made. She pointed out that essentially there is no apparent reason to distinguish between legally nonconforming lots that are nonconforming due to width or area and those that are nonconforming due to depth, provided that all other requirements of the zoning code, including setbacks, are met.

Ms. Selig shared an example of a site plan. She referenced the Future Land Use Policy.

Board member Williams asked if this change would allow someone to build where they normally would not be allowed to. In response, Ms. Selig stated no, but if a situation such as this came about it would need to be brought to staff for a variance.

Board member Koss asked for clarification on setbacks and depth. Ms. Selig provided a brief background explaining how the depth issue came about. Board member Koss asked if there is a minimum depth. In response, Ms. Selig stated that technically there is a practical depth. Board member Koss inquired about setbacks for single family homes.

Board member Greenwood asked if this change came about due to a partnership the City has with a particular piece of property in the City or if it is just to clarify the ordinance as it was originally written. In response, Ms. Selig confirmed that this is just to address the language in the ordinance. She explained that this is an ordinance that would have a City-wide effect.

Board member Greenwood asked if the change in the ordinance will eliminate the variance process. In response, Ms. Selig replied affirmatively. Board member Greenwood inquired what would happen if a property had unique features that could not be addressed if the case did not go through the variance process. In response, it was clarified that the setbacks will still need to be met. Board member Greenwood asked if the setbacks are changing from what they currently are. It was confirmed that nothing is changing.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the audience.

Donna Kettner, 103 Derby St., stated that she's always wanted to have some sort of coverage in her driveway but was never able to due to certain restrictions. She mentioned that she is five feet short and asked if she would be able to now with the new setbacks. In response, it was clarified that setbacks will not changing.

Ms. Kettner offered to meet with Ms. Selig separately to review her property.

Lorraine Koss, 2115 N. Indian River Dr., mentioned that there are several homes on her street located precariously that drain into the river. She stated that as tax payers, they will be paying for their upgrades to sewer or septic. She asked if staff is referring to one of these properties. In response, Ms. Selig explained that this ordinance will affect all areas within City limits.

Ms. Eick clarified that it is not just the setbacks that need to be met but other zoning requirements as well.

Jennifer Riggs, 1629 N. Indian River Dr., asked if a smaller, irregular house would be allowed to be developed on a smaller lot anywhere in the City as long as it met the setback requirements. In response, Ms. Selig answered affirmatively. Ms. Eick clarified that this is only permitted in residentially zoned areas.

Ms. Eick added that, as a correction, it is only allowed in any district that permits single-family dwellings.

Robert Logsdon, 225 Broadview Dr., stated he has a non-conforming property along US1 in addition to his primary residence which is the adjacent property. He explained that since one of the properties lies within the US1 corridor he is unable to combine the properties as the County will not allow two different tax rates. Furthermore, he explained that his property located along the US1 corridor has been rezoned. He pointed out that his issues are that he would like to combine the two lots together and put a shed on the non-conforming lot.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Logsdon if he has spoken with staff about these issues. Mr. Logsdon replied affirmatively and noted that he had brought this to the attention of another redevelopment board which resulted in a meeting with City staff, but nothing had happened.

Chairman Dobrin asked Ms. Selig if she had met with Mr. Logsdon. Ms. Selig replied affirmatively and noted she was aware of his predicament.

Barbara Kinsey, 1628 Manor Dr., asked if the City was doing away with the variance process. Ms. Selig replied negatively.

Ms. Kinsey asked what the advantages and disadvantages are of the new Ordinance. Ms. Selig explained that currently if the width and area requirements are met and the depth requirement is not, a variance would be needed. However, if the scenario was reversed, a variance would not be needed. This amendment will include depth in the language of the ordinance which will help avoid these types of issues.

Ms. Kinsey asked how often a variance is applied for. In response, Ms. Selig explained that they are very rare.

Ms. Kinsey inquired why staff would want to address an issue that hardly ever comes up. It was clarified that staff is only looking to simplify the process.

Additionally, Ms. Kinsey expressed concerns regarding the lack of review by City staff in some instances if this amendment is approved. In response, Ms. Selig assured her that if any individual wished to build on a property they would still need to go through the permit process which also includes an extensive review by City staff.

Board member Koss asked for further clarification. It was explained that currently a home could be built as long as it meets the criteria, but if the depth is not met a variance is still needed. By approving the ordinance it would allow builders to move forward as long as all criteria is met.

Motion by Lawrence Koss, seconded by Jake Williams, to recommend approval to City Council of Ordinance No. 05-2018 amending Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3 of the City Code, to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record.

The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

**B. PZ-18-02000002 – Zoning Text Amendment (Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District)**

Ordinance No. 06-2018

An ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, Brevard County, Florida; amending Appendix A, Article XI, Section 22 of the Code of the City of Cocoa to allow large scale commercial/mixed-use buildings on certain properties within the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District, Cocoa Village Sub-district, as more particularly depicted on Exhibit "A" attached hereto; amending the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay Regulating Plan to allow for the same; providing for the repeal of prior inconsistent ordinances and resolutions, incorporation into the code, severability, and an effective date.

Ms. Selig pointed out that the City is the applicant and that the requested action is to consider an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, amending Appendix A, Article XI, Section 22 of the City Code to allow large scale commercial/mixed-use buildings on certain properties within the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District, Cocoa Village Sub-district.

She explained that the proposed amendment is to specifically allow "Commercial/Mixed Use - Large" buildings, as described in the Regulating Plan, to be developed on specific parcels within the Cocoa Village Sub-district. The "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" designation is described in the Regulating Plan as follows:

"A building lot located and designed to accommodate a multi-story building with commercial, office and/or multiple dwellings in any story that is designed for larger lot sizes."

Ms. Selig shared Exhibit A, depicting six parcels in Cocoa Village that lay south of Factory St. She stated that, as before, the board shall consider the need and justification for the change as well as the Comprehensive Plan when amending the code.

Ms. Selig provided a brief history and explained the need and justification for the change. She explained that, as previously mentioned, the Regulating Plan for the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District and the Cocoa Village Sub-district currently only permits a maximum of five stories under the Commercial Mixed-Use - Medium building type, which is the largest presently allowed under the sub-district. Additionally, the regulating plan does not address height in terms of a maximum number of feet; however, the plan allows the first floor of a non-residential building to have a maximum of twenty feet and each floor thereafter a maximum of twelve feet.

Furthermore, a Commercial Mixed-Use - Medium building with non-residential use in this sub-district could currently be a maximum of five stories or sixty-eight feet. The potential maximum height allowed under the proposed amendment, i.e., designating certain properties in the Cocoa Village Sub-district to allow "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" buildings, will be eight stories or one hundred and four feet, but only on those certain properties included in the amendment. The amendment would not allow larger scale development throughout the Cocoa Village sub-district.

Ms. Selig explained the "step down" effect which has gradually reduced building heights. She pointed out that the maximum height of one hundred four feet is not extended throughout Cocoa Village, which will protect the downtown core of the Village and its quaint and historic character. This maximum height and "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" designation will be permitted only on these six parcels near the existing communications tower.

Board member Ervin asked the height of Oleander Point. A person in the audience stated that it is one hundred fifteen feet at the top of the roof line.

Ms. Selig explained that the increased height allowed under a Commercial/Mixed-Use – Large building type allows for the incorporation of needed public features into the building design. For example, increasing the maximum building height will allow developers to include a large parking garage with public parking spaces within their proposals that may not have otherwise been financially viable.

She pointed out that the Community Redevelopment Plan expressly states that a City Parking Garage, centrally located in the Historic Cocoa Village, is a high priority project for redevelopment. Furthermore, the Community Redevelopment Plan identifies the properties between Florida Avenue and Brevard Avenue as "ideal" for the future location of multi-story buildings because of their location on the top of the old dune formation along the river.

Ms. Selig mentioned the future land use element policies 1.1.4.1 and 1.2.1.8.

She explained that the site is designated Mixed-Use by the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Policy 1.1.2.6. The Mixed-Use category is intended to provide a mixture of residential, commercial, office, recreational and institutional uses.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the Board.

Board member Sengel noted that he would like to speak once everyone has had their chance to discuss the item.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the audience and called upon Ms. Riggs to speak.

Ms. Riggs pointed out that both her and husband had sent emails to staff regarding this ordinance.

Ms. Selig noted that she had provided the board members with the information she had received prior to the meeting.

Ms. Riggs explained that one of her concerns is about precedent. She mentioned that there have been other developments in the past that have not followed the transect concept and that concept has been instantiated in Cocoa's Comprehensive Plan. She expressed that she does not feel that the proposed height of the hotel will suit the village, and that something smaller would make more sense. Ms. Riggs noted that she feels there are other solutions to the parking situation. Additionally, she shared her concern that if the City allows a ten-story building in the village they will begin popping up all over. She stated that she does not feel this is a change that is positive and pointed out that the village is Cocoa's key asset and should be developed to enhance this quality. She expressed that she does not want to see the City turn into Daytona Beach or Miami.

Eleanor Riggs shared that when her and her family first came to Cocoa they fell in love with the village. She asked that the Board remember their responsibility and reconsider this ordinance.

Edward Green, 104 Riverside Dr., pointed out that, in all due respect, the plan is structured to be a maximum of seven or eight stories, and not ten as stated by Mrs. and Ms. Riggs. He explained that at seven stories the hotel would only be about seventy feet high and at eight stories it is only seventy-eight feet which would then only be eight feet higher than the current code allows. Furthermore, he explained that this change would allow the builders to construct a hotel that would offer specific benefits to the City and that this change would only affect a specific project on a specific lot. He also noted that even if one hundred and four feet were allowed it does not mean that it would be approved by the City and there are other restrictions in place that still offer protection. He stated that he understands that there are a lot of people that have concerns but feels that this project was crafted carefully. He asked that everyone keep in mind that realistically the City is only looking at a three to five-foot difference from what is currently allowed.

Walt Roslin, 1628 Manor Dr., asked if a study was conducted to show how the City will benefit from a hotel. He stated that we are not Savannah, Georgia and that this is a small town. He noted that he feels that this is more about money and not about the citizens. He asked everyone to remember that this area is unique. He commented on the "big white elephant" of City Hall and that he disagreed with the development of it back when it was built due to the fact that it does not architecturally fit the concept of the Village.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Roslin how long he has lived in Cocoa. In response, Mr. Roslin stated since 1977.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Roslin how he felt when Oleander Point was built. In response, Mr. Roslin stated that he felt the development of Oleander Point was absurd as well.

Mr. Roslin asked who will benefit from this hotel and how much money was spent conducting a study of the hotel.

Michael Harner, 31 Derby St., stated he is against the change. He expressed that he felt the original plan with the step-down approach was more appealing. He noted that he, along with some of his neighbors, are invested in this community and that he feels if the height is increased to one hundred and four feet then someone will want one hundred and five feet and it will never end.

Pat Chambers, 37 Derby St., explained that she bought her home here because it is a quaint place to live. She stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Harner.

Furthermore, Ms. Chambers asked if it is true that only thirty-three parking spaces would be added for village parking. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that two hundred and twelve parking spaces would be added.

Ms. Chambers reiterated that there will never be an end if this is approved.

Ms. Kettner stated that she has had a business here for thirty-five years and has always wanted more parking but feels that this is not the way to do it. She passionately explained her concerns and the fact that she is against this monstrosity. She stated that if this is approved she will put a for sale sign on her property and move. She noted that she feels this can be done but needs to be done thoughtfully and cannot be rushed.

Chairman Dobrin asked Ms. Kettner to clarify that it is not that she is against a unique boutique hotel in the Village, but that she is only against the hotel that is being proposed. In response, she answered affirmatively. She reiterated that she wants more parking and that she's been asking for years but this is not what she had in mind. She mentioned that she has spent many years building her clientele and that this hotel will ruin it.

Ms. Hamilton mentioned the developers meeting that took place prior to this meeting that allowed citizens to share their concerns.

She shared information about the footprint of the hotel and stated that it is recognized that there is an appetite for a hotel in the City.

Mr. Lallo explained that the initial hotel brands that were looked at are Marriott and Comfort Suites.

Ms. Hamilton added that, in regards to the height concerns and the concerns regarding the views of the river, it is worth pointing out that some of those views have already been taken away from several different pre-existing buildings. She explained that this meeting is a reflection of the previous developers meeting and that if staff felt there wasn't enough positive feedback they wouldn't have brought it forward to the Board.

Chairman Dobrin inquired about the design.

Board member Williams mentioned the Bank of America building as an example.

Mr. Lallo explained that staff is currently in the process of creating a letter of intent to the developer. He pointed out that the CRA owns the property and they will need to be satisfied with the anesthetics of the hotel.

It was asked if the CRA will be donating the property to the developers. Mr. Lallo explained that this has not been determined and is still under negotiation.

Ms. Hamilton explained that there was a request for proposals that went out at the beginning of the year. It was clarified that the City is not handing the developer a blank check and everything is still being negotiated.

Board member Williams advised that currently the CRA has the say as to what kind of development will go there but if they were to give up the property than they would not.

Ms. Kettner stated that the City would still need to get permits. She raised concerns that the City is keeping secrets from the community and that the City can never seem to give solid answers.

Kathy Johnson, stated that she lives in the village and has owned a business here for ten years. She explained that at first she felt this was a good idea but then felt that the brand of hotel needs to be announced and that the height being considered is too high. She asked if her neighbors would have received a notice of this meeting as she did not see them in the audience. In response, Ms. Selig explained that notices were mailed to all property owners within three hundred feet of the property.

Ms. Johnson stated that she likes the idea of the step down plan as it seems more fitting for the historic village. She explained that she is for the growth of the village but that this needs to be done thoughtfully and slowly and there is no rush for development.

Danny Guy Day, 625 Brevard Avenue, noted that he is a tenant, and asked if their buildings will be demolished because they may be in the way of the developers. He stated that he agrees with some of the people that spoke before him and he is concerned with the future of his business.

Robert Kenaston, 107 Riverside Dr., stated that he has lived here all his life and is against the rush to approve this and that there is a lack of transparency. He noted that there is not any information on the City's website. He expressed that he feels there are no solid answers. He asked for more transparency and asked the Board to recommend slowing down on any decision making to Council.

Mr. Lallo explained that it is contingent on the CRA to approve the design of this hotel. He explained that this is the third time the City has tried to develop this property. He provided the history on the townhomes, which was an idea that a developer proposed the last time but the CRA was more hopeful for a more intense use. He explained that when there are visitors there is nowhere here for them to stay. He also reiterated that the City would not just give this property away without something in return. He pointed out that new jobs will be created with this hotel.

Ms. Hamilton stated that when the RFP was being considered at multiple levels it was brought to the CRA. The CRA encourages the input of the community and Ms. Hamilton encouraged all to attend the CRA meetings.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Lallo if he had seen other projects the developers have completed. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that he has seen photos of various projects but each one is different.

Board member Greenwood asked Mr. Lallo if he felt there was a majority vote at the previous developers meetings. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that in his opinion he felt about ninety percent voted in favor of the hotel.

Board member Greenwood asked Mr. Lallo if Chase Bank is considered part of historic Cocoa Village. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that his opinion is subjective but he would say no.

Board member Greenwood explained that as being the owner of Murdocks, he feels this is a positive change for the village and that it will bring at least one hundred additional people to the village daily.

Mr. Lallo stated that staff is hopeful that the hotel will offer additional parking to help address concerns.

Board member Greenwood pointed out that City Hall is almost as tall as the proposed hotel.

A question was raised in regards to a conflict of interest, as Board member Greenwood is a property owner close to the hotel. It was asked if he needed to abstain from voting. Ms. Eick asked for a moment to look into the issue.

Board member Koss explained that he has done some research on other hotels built in historic districts in Florida and explained that he found the majority of them have a fifty foot height limit on commercial buildings. He noted that he feels sixty-eight feet is enough to keep the balance between the growth of the village and the historic qualities of the village.

Board member Ervin stated she is concerned that if the board approves one hundred and four feet and the current developer backs out then another developer may come along wanting to utilize the maximum height because it has already been approved. She agreed that a hotel and additional parking would be beneficial but the current code should be kept.

Board member Williams agreed and reiterated that he has seen contingencies happen before and so the current code should be kept. He feels the developer should work with the City and what we have.

Board member Sengel asked Ms. Selig if this item should be brought to a Board of Adjustment meeting as a variance rather than changing the entire plan. In response, Ms. Selig stated no, that this is really the only way to address the change.

Board member Sengel explained that at this point there are still a lot of uncertainties and feels that the City should stick with the current code.

Board member Greenwood asked why staff chose this height when it is not needed. In response, Ms. Selig explained that the City did not "choose" a height, it was included in the regulation as the City would be changing from Commercial-Medium to Commercial-Large.

Ms. Hamilton stated that this height increase is based on these six parcels. She pointed out that staff took into account the heights of various pre-existing buildings along the river and decided that the hotel would not be higher than what already exists.

Board member Greenwood asked for clarification on what the motion should include, whether it be limiting the hotel to a certain height, or holding off altogether.

Alternate member Green noted that the hotel would need to have the eighth floor in order to meet the requirement for parking. She mentioned that she had spoken with business owners in the downtown area and it seems that this would be a positive benefit as it will bring more customers to the village. She mentioned that this is a specific zoning for a specific location and that this is not a spot zoning where someone can come along and say "they did it there we can do it here". She explained that the difference in one story can really impact the village and its parking situation.

Chairman Dobrin asked if anyone from the audience wished to speak in favor of the hotel.

Ms. Eick pointed out that everyone in the audience should be given the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Riggs asked if two lane traffic will support the traffic that will come with the hotel. In response, it was noted that a traffic analysis would need to be reviewed.

Ms. Kinsey asked if this is a growing economy why other suggestions haven't been brought forward from other developers for the City to consider. She feels that there is not enough of a majority vote to support this decision. She encouraged the Board to vote against changing the code.

Ms. Eick referenced the code regarding Board member Greenwood's vote on this motion. She stated that her opinion is that there would not be a conflict of interest due to speculation of what gains Mr. Greenwood has at this point.

Deputy Mayor Blanco, Board Liaison, stated that one hundred and four feet is already permitted in the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay district and the vote this evening is specifically for six parcels that are not part of the historic Cocoa Village designation. She asked that the Board keep this in mind when making their vote.

Motion by Aleck Greenwood, seconded by Marilyn Green, to recommend approval to the City Council of Ordinance No. 06-2018 as presented.

The vote on the motion was 2-6. The motion was denied.

Discussion was held regarding whether this item could be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Selig suggested several dates and polled the Board members to establish the next meeting date. It was established that the next meeting date will be August 13, 2018.

Ms. Arsenault pointed out that a roll call would need to be done for the vote on Ordinance No. 06-2018.

Ms. Arsenault called the roll.

AYES: Greenwood, Green.

NAYS: Williams, Sengel, Dobrin, Koss, Ervin, Moore.

Discussion was held regarding the ordinances being brought before the Board at the next meeting.

## V. OTHER BUSINESS:

**A.** Tree Board Update: Two trees have been removed in City Right of Way (13 Oleander St. and 215 Brevard Ave.). Both will be replaced with Crepe Myrtle trees.

**B.** Recent Development Update

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

None.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The Board members established that the next meeting would be held on Monday, August 13, 2018.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion to adjourn by Sherry Ervin, seconded by Larry Koss.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Approved on this 10 day of September, 2018.

Michael Dobrin, Chairman

Monica Arsenault, Board Secretary