

**TOWN OF DUCK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
March 12, 2014**

The Planning Board for the Town of Duck convened at the Duck Meeting Hall on Wednesday, March 12, 2014.

Present were: Chair Joe Blakaitis, Vice Chair John Fricker, Ron Forlano, Tim McKeithan and Marc Murray.

Absent: None.

Also present were: Director of Community Development Andy Garman, Council Liaison Chuck Burdick and Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross.

Others Present: Chris Nason of Beacon Architecture, Michael Strader of Quible & Associates, P.C., Dick McAuliffe, Theresa Cullen, Marty Barnette and Andrew Meredith.

Absent: None.

Chair Blakaitis called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Board for March 12, 2014 at 6:35 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

ZTA 14-001 – Application for a Zoning Text Amendment by Michael Strader, P.E., of Quible and Associates, P.C., on Behalf of FMC/NV Sanderling SPE, LLC, to Amend the Zoning Ordinance of the Town of Duck, North Carolina, Pertaining to Maximum Building Height in the C-2 General Commercial Zoning District - Town Code Section 156.034(D)(6)

Director Garman stated that the items in the Board's packets included a number of sheets; a site plan drawing with aerial photos to give a plan view perspective of the entire property; section drawings of the north end building including what it would look like if it was raised to three stories; as well as an elevation study that included existing buildings on the site and various measurements from sea level and from grade to the main portion of the roof and to the cupolas. He stated that the applicant provided some renderings of the Salt Houses and Palmer's Island houses for comparison since the RS-2 zoning district (the adjacent zoning district) allows a 52 foot height limit. He stated that there were also photographic renderings of the north end building; both existing and proposed. He stated that the applicant had a presentation that they wanted to give to the Board.

Dick McAuliffe was recognized to speak. Mr. McAuliffe gave a short background on the Sanderling to the Board and audience. He stated that his group came in during the spring of 2008 when the ownership changed and made some renovations. He stated that in May 2012 the previous owners sold the property and Northview purchased it, completing some more renovations. He stated that their new plans included an addition of guest rooms for the third floor on the north end. He felt it would allow the Sanderling Inn to generate an additional \$2 million a year in revenue, which would result in increased tax revenue for Dare County and the Town of Duck. He noted that they needed the revenues to continue to improve what they have undertaken.

Chris Nason of Beacon Architecture was recognized to speak. Mr. Nason presented the Board with composite renderings along with larger renderings for them to review.

Director Garman noted that the applicants submitted a revised ordinance with the 45 foot height limitation and minimum roof pitch to qualify for the height increase. He added that the request had changed from the original request. Chris Nason pointed out that the change was a 5:12 pitch versus a 6:12. Director Garman stated that the draft language Town staff prepared in February was now being submitted as per the applicant's request, as opposed to the 52 foot limit.

Chair Blakaitis noted that the maximum height limitation was 35 feet when buildings were less than 5:12 roof pitch. He stated that there were two maximum heights – 35 and 45 feet. He noted that the Board had discussed maximum building height of 35 feet for the north end at the last meeting and it was said that it had to be less. Director Garman stated it was the same language and meant that the applicant could go up to the higher number if they provided a steeper pitched roof for architectural purposes. He added that it was not designed to add another story. Chair Blakaitis clarified that it did not state what the height had to be for a given building height. Director Garman stated that it did not and was just the maximum.

Member McKeithan asked how many guest units currently existed at the Sanderling Inn. Dick McAuliffe stated that they had 96 guest rooms and suites on the property, plus five homes on Station Bay Drive. Member McKeithan asked when the new owners bought the property in 2012; if they developed a five year plan that included adding a third floor on the north wing. Mr. McAuliffe stated that they had discussed with the previous owners the potential of putting in a third floor on the north end and when the new owners came in, he was asked what revenue ideas would increase the value and he suggested the third floor addition.

Member Murray clarified that the grade at the main building was higher than the grade of the north building. Director Garman stated that at the main inn, the grade was approximately eight feet; the north end was about eight feet, making the grade fairly comparable. He stated that when it's measured from sea level, the main roof on the new north end building ended up being 52 feet nine inches above sea level. He added that the main roof, not including the cupolas, on the main building was 47 feet, ten inches above sea level. He stated that the new north end building was 4.5 to five feet taller above sea level. Chair Blakaitis clarified that it was that way because of the three stories. Director Garman stated he was correct. He noted that it was measuring from the main top of ridge to top of ridge and did not include the cupolas. He stated that the cupolas on the main end added another six feet of height to the building.

Chair Blakaitis asked what building height was being worked with on the north building with the illustrations. Director Garman stated it was with the 52 feet above sea level. He added that it was confusing because it wasn't the measurement, but a relative measurement. Chair Blakaitis asked if this was with a 45 or 52 foot height limit. Director Garman stated it was for the 45 foot height limit. He added that the new north end building would be 45 feet tall, based on the way staff would measure height since they have to measure from grade. He stated that, looking at the two structures side by side, the north end building would appear to be slightly taller just to the top of the roof, not including the cupola.

Member Forlano asked what the number of units was per building. Dick McAuliffe stated that the north end had 32 guest rooms; the main inn had 29 guest rooms; the event house had one; and the south building had 35 guest rooms. Member Forlano asked if the applicant was granted permission to put a third story on the north building, how many rooms would be added. Mr. McAuliffe stated that there would be 16 potentially, but were considering some suites that would reduce the number. Member Forlano asked if the suites would consist of multiple bedrooms. Mr. McAuliffe stated that it would. Chair Blakaitis clarified that it would still be the same number of bedrooms. Mr. McAuliffe stated he was correct. Member Forlano asked if the first floor of the south building were rentable. Mr. McAuliffe stated that they were new guest rooms that were added in the renovations that were completed in the last off season.

Member Murray asked if the third story already existed. Dick McAuliffe stated that there were bi-level suites that go up to the third floor as well as some storage space. Member Murray clarified that it wasn't a true third story. Mr. McAuliffe stated he was correct.

Theresa Cullen of 122 Martin Lane was recognized to speak. Ms. Cullen asked if the Board had considered the need for additional parking with the new use. Chair Blakaitis stated that the Board had not discussed it. Ms. Cullen asked if it would be discussed. Chair Blakaitis stated they may. Member Murray asked if the Board was going to limit the discussion to building height only. Chair Blakaitis stated that it wasn't limited to building height.

Chair Blakaitis asked what considerations were given to the future parking requirements for the additional 16 rooms. He noted that this issue was not before the Board at this time. Dick McAuliffe stated that they have one extra space than what was currently required. He stated that if they had 16 rooms, they would need 15 additional parking spaces. He added that they have put together a preliminary plan that would allow them to come up with the 15 spaces spread throughout the property. Chair Blakaitis thought the Board needed to be concerned with what problems may arise when the time comes for those 15 spaces. Mr. McAuliffe stated that they didn't want to put the horse before the cart and felt that the text amendment approval was important, including ensuring they had wastewater issues taken care of as well as making sure the capacity would not be an issue.

Member Murray noted that in the comments the Board received, parking was mentioned but the loading and unloading seemed to be a larger issue. He thought it was somewhat unrelated to the height of the building. Chair Blakaitis stated he was correct. He stated that he didn't want an issue in the future that could not be addressed. He asked where the room was for the 15 additional parking spaces. Dick McAuliffe stated that there was space near the north end of the building as well as across the street from the Sanderling Inn. Chris Nason noted that they would

be coming back to the Planning Board with a more detailed plan through the Conditional Use Permit process.

Chair Blakaitis asked if there was wastewater on the south part of the property near NC 12. Michael Strader stated that everything at the Sanderling was on a central sewer system. Chair Blakaitis asked what was on the south part of the property. Mr. Strader stated that there was no infrastructure in that area. Chair Blakaitis asked if the applicant would propose putting in parking in that area. Mr. Strader stated that it was possible. Dick McAuliffe stated that he never considered that area for parking.

Member Murray asked if the volume necessary to make the project cost effective meant that it had to be a full third story addition. Dick McAuliffe stated that it was. Chair Blakaitis asked what the reason was. Mr. McAuliffe stated that it was for the return on the investment.

Chair Blakaitis stated that there have been some public comments received regarding deliveries. He asked the applicant to address it. Dick McAuliffe stated that the delivery factor would not change and the additional guest rooms would not require additional deliveries.

Member Forlano asked the applicants if they have been given access to the comments that the Board had received. Michael Strader stated that they had. Dick McAuliffe stated that he had prepared responses to some of the comments to address any inaccuracies or misunderstandings. He went on to hand them out to the Board and audience.

Member McKeithan stated that the underlying, bigger issue he was wrestling with was the fact that the Board was asked to consider raising the height of a structure in Duck that, even though it was in a unique zone, it would create a precedent and would make it difficult to make an exception that could potentially carry forward and change the whole structure of the community. Member Forlano stated that the issue was all predicated on the zoning district. He added that it was unique to the entire Town. He did not think allowing the 45 feet height in this district would overflow to the Village Commercial or any other district in Town. Member McKeithan thought it was still opening the door for other districts to make the same request.

Chair Blakaitis stated that the applicant was requesting approval based upon the fact that the adjacent district allowed a 52 foot height limit. Member Murray stated that it was the Board's job to put a finer point on the Land Use Plan. He added that this district was a hotel district and by that very nature, they are expected to be larger than a home. He felt that the Board needed to focus on what will happen if the Town prohibits the height increase. He added that the applicant was interested in beautifying the property and they could get a third floor with a flat top roof to be below the 35 foot height limit, but he wasn't sure he would like to see that on the building.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that the whole point of the Town incorporating was to keep out the big buildings. He wondered why anyone would think after 12 years that people would think the Town would accept a change. He stated that the Board would have a lot to answer if they allow any change to the height limit. He thought that when the new owners of the Sanderling Inn considered buying the property, they must have completed some due diligence and should have known that they were buying something where the buildings were at or slightly above the height limit permitted. He added that now that they have done everything they could to maximize the

return on their investment property; they wanted to see if they could change the height limit. He didn't feel there was sufficient justification in the greater context to warrant a recommendation of approval to Town Council.

Chair Blakaitis agreed with Vice Chair Fricker's comments. He agreed that the image and tone of Duck with the zoning ordinance limit of 35 feet have been maintained for the past 12 years. He thought it was a tough sell to make a change now. He noted that there was a building in the Sanderling complex that was at 38 feet high, the north end was at 35.10 and the main end was 39.8 feet. Director Garman stated that the drawing of the north end showed a measurement on grade of 39 feet, 8 5/8 inches and was to the main portion of the roof and not the top of the cupola. Chair Blakaitis stated that he was having a hard time with the height and did not see any reason to allow any building to go any higher than a building that existed on the site. He stated that excellent comments came in and thought some lacked proper information, but were overall very valid.

Member Murray stated that the two owners closest to the property were the only owners in all of the comments that suggested any sort of compromise. He thought it motivated him to give more weight to the people that would be most directly affected and see if the Board couldn't come to some conclusion that would maintain the Town's standards. Chair Blakaitis thought most of the comments were from people not close to the Sanderling Inn.

Member Forlano stated that the intent was to keep the Village atmosphere. He didn't think the Board was comparing apples to apples in this situation as there weren't any tall buildings in a village area. He stated that the Sanderling has been before the Board countless times and they have usually approved everything. He added that they usually provided a quality result. He added that the only issue he had was the number of units on the property. He felt it would be an issue in the future. Member Murray agreed with Member Forlano's comments. He thought that being totally inflexible with regard to height was not wise.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that he had an issue with making an exception for one property owner to allow them to do something that no one else in Town could do. He noted that people that rent their homes would love to have homes that had a height of 45 feet in order to maximize their investment. Member McKeithan stated that the bottom line was that a precedent will be set if the building height would be raised higher than 35 feet. He wondered what the Board's response would be if another business in a different zoning district wanted the same exception. Member Murray thought that the Board's response would be that they were appointed to make decisions responsibly and if they can't do it, then variances, error in building locations, special exception and any other discretionary rights should be eliminated. Vice Chair Fricker thought each member of the Board had different views on the issue. Member Murray agreed.

Chair Blakaitis asked if it would make sense to not allow the Sanderling any extension in height since some of the buildings were higher than 35 feet. He further asked if it would make sense to grant them the elevation to the highest building that currently existed. Vice Chair Fricker asked why the Board should recommend a text amendment for something that the applicant noted would not help them. Chair Blakaitis asked if the applicant came before the Board with a plan to construct a new building that had a height of 39.8 feet and 3/8 inches, the Board could turn down the request. Director Garman stated that the Board could, adding that the limit was currently 35

feet. He stated that if a new building was constructed, it would have to meet the height and would be measured from either base flood elevation or grade depending on the flood zone.

Chair Blakaitis asked what pitch would be necessary to build in order to meet the 35 foot height and further asked what the pitch of the roof was for the south inn. Chris Nason stated that it was in the 4–5 range. He stated that the south inn had an extremely low pitch that was less than 3:12 pitch. Chair Blakaitis asked what it would give the applicant if they went from 35 to 45 feet. Mr. Nason stated that the 45 feet would give the 5:12 and 6:12 pitches. Member Murray asked Chair Blakaitis if he was asking if the applicant went with 39 feet, if that would help. Chair Blakaitis stated he was correct.

Chris Nason noted that the height regulations in Town have changed recently for common sense. Director Garman stated that they had changed for V-Zone properties. He explained that if there was a house in the V-Zone, it would have to be two feet free and clear above grade and then there would have to be another foot for the girder in order to measure 35 feet from that point, which makes the house appear to be 38 feet above grade.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that the visual appearance was one of his concerns. He thought the Board was concerned with working with the applicant within the existing ordinances to maximize their use of their property. He added that there were other considerations, which may be stormwater retention, sewage, parking, deliveries, etc. He asked what staff's position was and if Director Garman thought the request for a text amendment should be approved by the Board and recommended to Council. Director Garman stated that it was a complicated question. He added that it was a values-based decision. He stated that the Land Use Plan served as a guideline and states that: "...generally buildings should be two to three stories in height and generally 35 feet..." He stated that that language was not an absolute. Vice Chair Fricker agreed. Director Garman stated that it did not say all buildings should be 35 feet, but felt that the language was left like that so exceptions could be made. He added that this was a unique situation. He stated that it was the Planning Board and Council's job to decide the values-based decisions and a lot had to do with the ordinances as well as the input that is received. He stated that height was based on how it's measured as well as how it is relative to one another, adding that there were a lot of technical things that could go into a height decision.

Vice Chair Fricker stated that if the Board recommended a maximum height change from 35 to 45 feet, the Board would hear about how the Town allowed a 10 foot height increase. Member Murray stated that if one read through the comments received, people were concerned about the building, but were more concerned about the loading trucks on Station Bay Drive. He felt it shouldn't color the Board's decision regarding building height. He thought with regard to building height, the Board should look at scale, aesthetics and view shed issues. Dick McAuliffe noted that the Sanderling Inn does not accept deliveries on Station Bay Drive.

Director Garman thought some of the concerns raised in the comments could be addressed. He thought the overriding question was whether this would set a precedent that would affect future development decisions. He stated that from staff's perspective, he didn't think the height would be that noticeable, and it would probably make the building look better if it was elevated. He thought some of the other concerns could be mitigated. He thought there was definitely a major

concern in Duck regarding building height. Chair Blakaitis stated that the perception of how the Town treats the existing zoning was part of the issue.

Vice Chair Fricker asked if the applicant discussed how they plan to deal with additional parking or stormwater retention issues. Director Garman stated that he had not had any discussions in any more detail than what was provided to the Board at this meeting. He added that they have an idea that they think they can accomplish what would be required, but he has not seen a sketch showing it could be done. Chris Nason stated that he had a discussion with staff early on regarding how they should proceed and in that discussion it was determined that it was better to bring the text amendment forward first.

Michael Strader stated that he appreciated the discussion with the Board. He asked if the Sanderling suffered a catastrophic loss, how height would be measured. He asked if it would be from existing grade or base flood elevation. Director Garman stated that if the structure was torn down and rebuilt, it would be measured from base flood elevation plus one, which would be five feet above the existing grade. Mr. Strader stated that the 35 existing height would be measured from an elevation of 13. Director Garman stated he was correct. He added that it would put it at 48. He pointed out that the proposed height of the building as shown was 52.9 feet. Chris Nason noted that a new building with the freeboard and V-Zone requirements would bring the building to where they were looking to reach now.

Member McKeithan stated that he wasn't sure how the Town could allow this amendment and not open it up to all of the other jurisdictions when the Town has maintained 35 feet across all zones in Town over the past 12 years. Member Murray thought the more accurate statement would be that for 12 years, a building height of approximately 35 feet has been maintained, but changes have occurred. He stated that he didn't see fear as the reason for not making this change. He noted that he was not proposing that the Board accept the proposal of the 45 foot height limit.

Michael Strader stated that if the Board felt that some additional control was needed in order to recommend approval, he suggested the following language: "...maximum height limitation shall be 45 feet when existing buildings with a finished floor elevation below current base flood elevation have a 5:12 roof pitch or greater..." Director Garman thought it was an option. Vice Chair Fricker asked if it was an option that the Board should consider at this meeting with regard to advertising guidelines. Director Garman stated that it could be considered by the Board. He added that when the advertising was done for the Council meeting, staff would make sure it would reflect what the amendment to Council to consider would be. He thought the Board could make a change tonight and still proceed.

Member Murray suggested measuring the height from base flood elevation. He thought it would be cleaner as it would encourage people to build at or above base flood. He added that it would not change the building height, but it would be measured from base flood. Vice Chair Fricker thought the approach was like a moving target with regard to where and how height was measured. He added that if the applicant had a fallback position, they should state it up front. He stated that he was not going to vote in favor of the text amendment.

Member McKeithan stated that he was unclear on how the Board could close the gap on the height issue. He asked if the proposal could be restated. Member Murray asked if the top of the floor was two feet below base flood. Michael Strader stated that base flood plus freeboard was 13. He added that they were currently just below eight feet. Member Murray noted that base flood was 12. Director Garman stated it would give them five feet with the freeboard. Member Murray stated that they were below base flood. He added that if anyone else in Town applied for a building permit, they would be required to either fill or raise their floor on pilings. Chair Blakaitis pointed out that the applicant was not doing that. He added that the building would stay as is.

Vice Chair Fricker moved to recommend to Town Council that they not approve the application as submitted. Member McKeithan seconded.

Motion carried 3-2 with Member Murray and Member Forlano dissenting.

Chair Blakaitis called for a two minute break. The time was 8:13 p.m.

Chair Blakaitis reconvened the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

CUP 14-001 – Application by Marty Barnette, PLS of Barnette Integrated Land Development (BILD), on behalf of Andrew Meredith, Property Owner, to Consider an Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit for Redevelopment of a Portion of the Property Located at 1448 Duck Road

Director Garman stated that the Board would be considering a Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Marty Barnette on behalf of Andrew Meredith of North Duck Watersports. He stated that the property had a lot of history with the original Conditional Use Permit approved on the property by Dare County in 1992 for the boat rental facility. He stated that the property operates as a watersports business with a lot of buildings, many of which were removed due to Hurricane Irene. He stated that only one larger building exists on the north side of the property, which was originally a hunt club and has been flooded a number of times. He stated that there was a kiosk, where the business owner rents jet skis.

Director Garman stated that the applicant was proposing to leave the south half of the property intact and redevelop the northern half of the property. He added that they intended to remove the older buildings that have been flooded numerous times. He stated that the new building would be a 1,200 square foot retail building on the first floor and a 600 square foot accessory apartment on top. He explained that the Town's ordinance allowed accessory apartments to be over commercial uses as long as they were no more than 50 percent of the floor area of the commercial use below.

Director Garman stated that the building would be elevated significantly above grade, with the finished floor elevation at 10 feet. He stated that the current elevation of the property was between three and four feet above sea level, which was why the building has flooded so many times. He noted that the new building would meet all current building code and flood standards.

He stated that they would be constructing a new wastewater facility, ADA accessible public restrooms, as well as an ADA accessible building. He stated that they would be adding seven new parking spaces on the north side of the property for a total of 24 parking spaces on the entire property.

Director Garman stated that the site plan was fairly basic with some CAMA issues that are grandfathered since it was developed prior to 1999. He stated that as long as there was no net increase in their CAMA coverage within the buffer, the applicant would be allowed to reconfigure their CAMA coverage. He stated that they were proposing to remove a significant portion of their coverage in the buffer, thereby reducing the degree of nonconformity. He stated that there wasn't a significant amount of grading proposed except to support the wastewater system. He added that the Health Department has asked for some fill to support the wastewater system in that area given that it was low in the area. He stated that the applicant received a sight evaluation from the Health Department and staff received comments that the applicant could design and construct a wastewater system that they were proposing.

Director Garman stated that Town Engineer Mike Robinson looked at the site plan with regard to parking and driveway circulation and indicated that it met all Town requirements for traffic circulation and parking. He stated that the applicant was proposing some stormwater to support the new parking area and building. He explained that there would be a few small basins – one on the north side of the driveway, just west of the new parking spaces and the other partially below the building and between the building and northern property line. He noted that they would be fairly shallow basins as the new improvements did not require a large degree of stormwater. He stated that Town Engineer Robinson met with the applicant and reviewed stormwater calculations for the development and felt they met the requirements for stormwater as well as being consistent with the new stormwater LID ordinance that the Board had been discussing.

Director Garman stated that there were a few large trees on the north side of the property next to the existing building and the applicant is proposing to save those trees as well as adding landscaping that would buffer the new parking spaces with the road. He stated that they were proposing some lighting since it is a retail business. He noted that they were proposing two pole-mounted lights – one closer to the entrance and the other closer to the west side of the driveway as well as some additional lights that would be mounted under the porch of the roof.

Director Garman stated that the building appeared to be consistent with the Town's commercial design guidelines. He thought staff saw this as a favorable improvement to the property. He stated that it was indicated in the staff report that Town staff would recommend approval. He noted that some comments have been received and was in the Board's packet. He stated that most comments were favorable and received comments from several adjacent property owners as well as verbal comments from the owner of Beach Realty, who was in favor of the project. He stated that he also spoke to the HOA president of Sound Sea Village, who was also in favor of the project. He stated that he received comments from Allan Starr with specific details of the site plan which he forwarded to the Board with Town staff's response.

Chair Blakaitis asked Director Garman if he saw any insurmountable issues with regard to CAMA. Director Garman stated he did not. He added that the Town's field representative came out and staff reviewed the issues and felt it was consistent with the way they would do things.

Chair Blakaitis asked if Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross would be able to issue the final CAMA permit without other involvement from CAMA. Permit Coordinator Sandy Cross was recognized to speak. Permit Coordinator Cross stated that she would. Chair Blakaitis asked if the buildings that were destroyed by Hurricane Irene could be built back on the site. Director Garman thought the applicant was looking to use the coverage from those buildings to put into what they were proposing.

Member Forlano asked if there had been any problems with security over the years in the evening hours. Andrew Meredith was recognized to speak. Mr. Meredith stated that he had not. Member Forlano asked if additional lighting would be needed for security purposes. Andrew Meredith stated that it would be helpful in the off season. Marty Barnette was recognized to speak. Mr. Barnette stated that there were two overhead poles and the sign would be lit so it would comply with the Town code. Member Forlano asked what the average number of employees working were on a given day. Andrew Meredith stated that there were four.

Member McKeithan asked what the hours of operation would be for the retail facility. Andrew Meredith stated that he had not considered it for the retail facility. He stated that he would like expanded hours beyond the 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. hours for the retail facility.

Chair Blakaitis clarified that the business would still operate under the revised Conditional Use Permit that Dare County approved in 1992. Director Garman stated he was correct. Chair Blakaitis clarified that the conditions would be the same as the original Conditional Use Permit. Director Garman stated that all of the conditions related to the jet ski business would carry over. He added that the hours of operation and some of the standards that applied to jet ski operators were now codified in the Town's ordinance.

Member Forlano asked what would be sold in the retail facility. Andrew Meredith stated that it would be items that would complement watersports; i.e. t-shirts, hats, drinks, etc. Member Forlano clarified that if the applicant wanted an extension of time, he could close the business at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Meredith stated that he would like the retail facility to stay open until 9:00 – 10:00 p.m., especially in the summer season. Director Garman cautioned the Board from trying to dictate the hours of retail when the Town doesn't do that for other retail businesses. He added that parking would be less of an issue in the evening because the jet ski operation would cease.

Member Forlano moved that the Planning Board recommend to Town Council for approval of Conditional Use Permit application 14-001 as presented. Chair Blakaitis seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the February 12, 2014 Regular Meeting

Member Murray had a correction to Page 1 of the minutes. He suggested going through the entire set of minutes and correct "stormwater" to read "stormwater management" for consistency. He had a correction to Page 14 of the minutes.

Vice Chair Fricker moved to approve the February 12, 2014 minutes as amended. Member Murray seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

STAFF COMMENTS

None.

BOARD COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chair Blakaitis adjourned the meeting. There was no vote.

The time was 8:49 p.m.

Approved: _____
/s/ Joe Blakaitis, Chairman