

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING
APRIL 26, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Edward Viola, Chairman
John Burrage, Massey Loughman, Lynne Matthews,
Heinz Schmidt, Charles Zajicek, Edward Zapke

OTHERS PRESENT: Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official
Mitchell Austin, Urban Design Planner
Lisa Hannon, Zoning Coordinator
Joan LeBeau, Chief Planner
Mayor Harvey Goldberg
Vice Mayor Bill Albers
Bill Schindler, Anna Callwood

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting - May 24, 2010

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Meeting of March 22, 2010
 - Mr. Burrage MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED approval of the March 22, 2010 minutes.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- Recording Secretary Kelly swore in all participants.
- A. ZA-02-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code of Ordinances known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 16, Application Review and Approval Requirements; Amending Subsection 16.8, Application for Special Exception, amending all references to the Department of Community Development to be Urban Design Division; Amending Subsection 16.8(e)(5), Adding Exception for Home Occupations; Adding Subsection 16.8(e)(6)a,b,c, d,e,f,g, Requirements for Application for a Special Exception for Home Occupations and Renumbering Accordingly; Amending Subsection 16.8(k), Approval Criteria for Special Exceptions other than Home Occupations; Adding Subsection 16.8(l) Approval Criteria for Special Exception Requests to be Located in Residential Dwelling Units and Renumbering Accordingly; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
 - Ms. Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official, advised staff had prepared a list of criteria based on citizen input specific to special exception requests for home occupations, pointing out those criteria were similar to that for limited home occupations but addressed the fact

some limited traffic was anticipated and considerations must be made to determine the impact of a requested use on a neighborhood. She drew members' attention to a comparison of criteria between "home occupations" and "limited home occupations," stating same was intended to allow review of requests while ensuring a neighborhood was not negatively impacted by any home occupation. She announced City Council initiated this proposed amendment to address concerns raised due to applicants requesting approval to operate home based businesses. She stated staff had held numerous citizen meetings to determine the community's concerns relative to this issue such as increased traffic and noise or the possibility of a detrimental effect on the character of a residential neighborhood as well as property values. She concluded the Urban Design Division recommended approval of ZA-02-10, offering to answer any questions of the Commission.

- Mr. Zajicek asked how this would affect music teachers or tutors.
- Ms. Tubbs replied both would require a special exception.
- Mr. Zajicek confirmed both would also require payment of a Local Business Tax (LBT).
- Mr. Burrage asked about babysitting.
- Ms. Tubbs replied that also would require a special exception, stating some of these issues were outlined within the following agenda item under "Uses Permitted in Residential Zoning Districts."
- Ms. Matthews requested definitions of both "Home Occupation" and "Limited Home Occupation" be added to the list of definitions in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs). She expressed vehement opposition to ZA-02-10, particularly the requirement for a special exception in situations such as the existing home occupation on Guadalupe Drive.
- Mr. Viola confirmed staff had received no objections to the latter.
- Mr. Zapke requested clarification of how the City would enforce traffic limitations, asserting there was no method other than if a neighbor complained. He observed the proposed home occupation criteria stated "no more than three vehicle trips," recalling the Punta Gorda Isles (PGI) Civic Association (CA) proposed two. He suggested the criteria read "none" as the enforcement would be identical.
- Ms. Tubbs responded that concern was raised at a City Council meeting, noting the original recommendation to staff was to not mention traffic; however, staff later received other direction in that even though traffic was difficult to enforce and/or monitor, a specific limitation provided a neighbor the ability to specify the basis for a complaint.

- Mr. Zapke asserted many residents would be satisfied if home occupations were simply prohibited.
 - Ms. Tubbs noted the vast majority of complaints focused on home businesses which did not adhere to limited home occupation criteria.
 - Mr. Zajicek asserted taxing tutors, for example, was ridiculous.
 - Mr. Bill Schindler, PGI CA Board of Directors, commented on traffic limitations, stating Mr. Bill Peterson, PGI CA President, and the BSI CA President agreed two vehicle trips per day was satisfactory.
 - Ms. Matthews asserted citizens purchased homes in a residential community, not a commercial district.
 - Mayor Harvey Goldberg clarified this was proposed to apply City-wide as opposed to only the Special Residential Overlay (SRO) zoning districts.
 - Mr. Schmidt commented many people conducted business out of their homes because of economic reasons. He questioned the problem if there was no impact to the neighborhood.
 - Mr. Viola expressed general opposition to business activity in a residential area.
 - Mr. Schmidt reiterated he did not see a problem if neighbors were not being disturbed.
 - Mr. Zapke asked if the ordinance could exclude the SRO districts from the stated proposal and disallow home occupations within same.
 - Ms. Tubbs replied that prohibition would need to be called out specifically in the SRO section of City Code via a stand alone ordinance. She clarified the Commission could continue this ordinance in the interim period. She then called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-02-10.
 - Ms. Matthews MOVED, Mr. Zajicek SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Burrage SECONDED to continue ZA-02-10 until May 24, 2010, to allow the drafting of another ordinance to exempt SROs. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- B. ZA-03-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code of Ordinances known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 3, Regulating Districts, Amending Section 3.2, EP, Environmental Preserve District, Subsection 3.2(c), Uses Permitted with Conditions, and Subsection 3.2(f), Special Exceptions; Amending Section 3.4, GS, General Single Family District, Amending Subsection 3.4(a), Permitted Principal Uses and Structures, Subsection 3.4(b), Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures, Subsection 3.4(c), Uses Permitted with Conditions, and Subsection 3.4(f), Special Exceptions; Amending Section 3.5, GM, General Multi-family

District, Amending Subsection 3.5(a), Permitted Principal Uses and Structures, Subsection 3.5(b), Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures, Subsection 3.5(c), Uses Permitted with Conditions, and Subsection 3.5(f), Special Exceptions; Amending Subsection 3.6, MH, Manufactured Home District, Subsection 3.6(e), Special Exceptions; Amending Subsection 3.7, NR, Neighborhood Residential District, Subsection 3.7.(b), Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures, Subsection 3.7(c), Uses Permitted with Conditions, and Subsection 3.7(f), Special Exceptions; Amending Article 4, Section 4.5, to require a Local Business Tax Receipt to be obtained to operate any group home facility, and amending Subsection 4.16, Day Care Centers, including provisions for adult day care centers; Amending Article 19, Section 19.3, Definitions; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.

- Ms. Tubbs stated while drafting the ordinance to allow home occupations by special exception, as discussed under the previous item, staff reviewed currently permitted uses in residential zoning districts and found several inconsistencies and duplications which created confusion. She explained some permitted uses which should require review prior to allowing operations to commence were listed as permitted; thus, this ordinance was drafted with several changes reflecting those concerns. She clarified the proposed amendments were intended to ensure appropriate review was given to uses which might have had a negative impact on a residential neighborhood if permitted without review and conditions. She noted the proposed amendments also corrected duplication of some uses listed as permitted in residential zoning districts. She expressed the Urban Design Division's recommendation for approval of ZA-03-10, offering to answer any questions.
- Mr. Zapke reiterated Ms. Matthews' request to have both "home occupation" and "limited home occupation" clearly defined.
- Mr. Zajicek asked if a group of friends gathering to paint, for example, with an instructor present would require an LBT.
- Ms. Tubbs replied giving lessons out of a home constituted teaching.
- Mr. Zajicek asserted same was excessively restrictive and ridiculous.
- Ms. Tubbs agreed a group of friends gathering to perform quilting, for example, certainly did not constitute a business.
- Mr. Schmidt asked why an LBT would be required as stated above.
- Ms. Tubbs replied State Statute required same.
- Mr. Zapke clarified this applied City-wide, asking if the SRO district must be specifically exempted as discussed under ZA-02-10.

- Ms. Tubbs replied affirmatively, outlining the City Code sections which must be amended. She then called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-03-10.
- Mr. Zajicek MOVED, Ms. Matthews SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Loughman SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-03-10 based upon the evidence and testimony presented but to exempt SRO districts and to make the necessary changes.
- VOTING AYE: Burrage, Loughman, Matthews, Schmidt, Zapke, Viola.
- VOTING NAY: Zajicek.
- MOTION CARRIED.
- Ms. Matthews then commented on ZA-02-10, specifically page 26 of the agenda material, stating no period of time was denoted under Section 26-16.8(l)(a). She further recommended the ordinance include both a time limit and sunset clause.
- C. ZA-05-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26, City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Code of Ordinances, known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 3, Regulating Districts, Section 3.13, Special Residential Overlay District, Subsection 3.13(l)(5), Storage of Vehicles and Watercraft; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
- Ms. Tubbs announced City Council initiated this action to address concerns raised by residents requesting consecutive watercraft permits. She explained when the watercraft permit ordinance was adopted, the intent was to allow a resident to keep or store same in their driveway for two days at a time; however, the ordinance, as drafted, did not prohibit consecutive permits. She clarified this proposed amendment would address this problem. She recommended approval of ZA-05-10 based upon staff's findings and conclusions.
- Mr. Loughman pointed out a situation where a resident's seawall failed and had to be replaced, asking if a boat which was typically kept at the resident's dock would be prohibited from being relocated to their driveway until the job was complete.
- Ms. Tubbs replied affirmatively, outside of the proposed time restrictions.
- Ms. Matthews mentioned sometimes a neighbor would allow temporary storage at their dock for such a situation.
- Ms. Tubbs called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-05-10.
- Ms. Matthews MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Burrage MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-05-10 based upon the evidence and testimony presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- D. ZA-06-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26, City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Code of Ordinances, known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 8, Standards of General Applicability, Section 8.21, Yard Sales, Subsection 8.21(c), Correcting a Citation therein; Amending Article 11, Sign Standards, Amending Section 11.3, Permitted Signs, Deleting Subsection 11.3(l), Public Event Banners; Deleting Subsection 11.3(p), Temporary Promotional Signs; and Renumbering Accordingly; Amending Section 11.6, Prohibited Signs and Devices, Subsections 11.6(g)(i)(j); Amending Subsection 11.8, Signs in Rights-of-way (ROWs); Subsection 11.8(c), Special Event Signs; Amending Article 13, Subsection 13.1, Purpose, Adding Regulations for Temporary Signs; Amending Subsections 13.2, 13.3, 13.5 and 13.6; Amending Article 19, Definitions, Section 19.3(85), Events; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
- Ms. Tubbs announced City Council initiated this action to address a concern relative to businesses in different zoning districts not being allowed the same opportunities to promote their businesses through the use of temporary signs and banners. She explained without specific restrictions, “permanent” temporary signage had been placed on several buildings within the City Center (CC) zoning district; thus, some regulation was necessary to maintain the City’s unique character. She advised the proposed amendment would create parity between the zoning districts and allow a specific amount of time for any temporary sign to remain in place. She read the list of prohibited signs and device into the record, as delineated in the agenda material, noting inflatable signs were not allowed. She provided a detailed review of all proposed changes, concluding with a recommendation for approval of ZA-06-10.
 - Mr. Zapke stated he understood directional signage to garage sales was prohibited; however, he had observed same on the corner of Bal Harbor Boulevard and Aqui Esta Drive on the previous Sunday and on the corner of Bal Harbor Boulevard and Marion Avenue this date.
 - Ms. Tubbs confirmed such signage was prohibited, acknowledging the difficulty in enforcing same on Sundays.
 - Mr. Zajicek confirmed garage sale permits were issued with a list of instructions. He then observed Section 26-13.2(b) limited each business promotion to seven days, pointing out some stores may run a month long sale.
 - Ms. Tubbs explained a sale could run for any length of time but could not be “promoted” longer than seven days with permanent signage; however, businesses could utilize a temporary “A” frame sign placed outside of same.
 - Mr. Zajicek opined the proposed restrictions were numerous.

- Ms. Matthews expressed opposition to the ordinance, asserting Punta Gorda was becoming “rule crazy.” She mentioned she was considering opening her own business; however, it would not be in Punta Gorda. She asserted the proposed restrictions were ridiculous, particularly requiring a permit to hold a sale.
- Ms. Tubbs clarified only the signage associated with a sale would require a permit.
- Mr. Schmidt asked what had triggered this action.
- Ms. Tubbs explained there had been a lack of parity with regard to what was allowed among the various commercial zoning districts, adding staff had received complaints regarding same.
- Ms. Matthews stated there was no mass influx of businesses wanting to open in Punta Gorda, opining this was due to the City’s failure to be business friendly.
- Mr. Zapke asked if the business community had provided input.
- Ms. Tubbs replied the ordinance was drafted based upon the sign survey which had been provided to the Punta Gorda Chamber of Commerce (PGCC) and the Charlotte County Chamber of Commerce (CCCC) on three different occasions as well as to as many associations and community groups possible. She clarified the proposed regulations were based on input from the citizens and businesses of the City.
- Mr. Zajicek expressed surprise at the lack of attendance this date. He then questioned the basis for only allowing a total of 33% of a business’ window to be obscured by signage.
- Ms. Tubbs replied that restriction had been in existence for a number of years, noting crime prevention guidelines recommended no more than 25%. She mentioned oversized signage had generated daily complaints prior to the limitation being put into place.
- Mr. Zajicek suggested asking a group of business people to draft an appropriate ordinance.
- Mr. Viola acknowledged members’ concerns; however, he pointed out while staff had made the proposed ordinance available to the business community, no one was present.
- Ms. Tubbs confirmed staff met personally with the PGCC but had received no feedback or consensus.
- Ms. Matthews countered she felt business owners were frustrated.
- Mayor Goldberg announced the PGCC held a public meeting with all of their members regarding this ordinance at the PGI CA a few weeks earlier, adding staff held another meeting for the general public in order to gain input. He noted the majority of complaints were derived from the business owners in Highway Commercial (HC) zoning

district, adding the portion of City Code applicable to same was extremely restrictive and not in parity with CC zoning district regulations. He reiterated there was no proposed limitation on sales but rather the outside signage associated with same.

- Mr. Zajicek stated he believed the City Code should be amended to be more liberal.
- Mayor Goldberg responded the City had received complaints regarding excessive banners and advertising within the CC district.
- Mr. Zajicek asked if staff had reviewed regulations of other municipalities.
- Ms. Tubbs replied affirmatively, stating most were much more restrictive.
- Mr. Schmidt suggested the City hold some type of “business summit.”
- Ms. Tubbs responded she held several meetings with the business community and citizens.
- Mr. Schindler opined there should be a balance between the concerns of the business community and the City’s residents. He pointed out the proposed changes were more in line with what had been requested by the business community. He spoke in favor of sign regulations.
- Mayor Goldberg advised the business community had made the distinction between promotions and events, specifically the PGCC, DMA and other merchants as well. He explained the City must manage sign clutter and try to create a balance.
- Mr. Zapke opined parity between the HC and CC districts was very important. He agreed the ordinance was restrictive; however, the business community had been provided more than ample opportunity to provide input, many of whom had done so. He suggested consideration be given to implementing a sunset provision.
- Mr. Burrage noted an ordinance could always be amended regardless of a sunset clause.
- Ms. Matthews countered a sunset clause would force the issue.
- Mr. Loughman commented on the large sale events held by car dealerships at the Event Center, stating other dealers suffered as a result for several weeks following same. He opined the proposed ordinance would level that playing field.
- Ms. Tubbs clarified this particular ordinance did not prohibit any business from holding an event at the Event Center.
- Mr. Zajicek spoke against the 33% window and 7 day sale limitations as stated earlier.
- Ms. Tubbs noted the 33% restriction had existed for years. She then called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-06-10.
- Mr. Burrage MOVED, Ms. Matthews SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Burrage SECONDED to recommend the proposed ordinance be amended to include a one year sunset clause. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Burrage MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-06-10 based upon the evidence and testimony presented contingent upon the above stated amendment.
 - VOTING AYE: Burrage, Loughman, Schmidt, Zapke, Viola.
 - VOTING NAY: Matthews, Zajicek.
 - MOTION CARRIED.
- E. ZA-07-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code of Ordinances known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 3, Regulating Districts, Subsection 3.9, CC, City Center District, by exempting the Trabue Woods Historic Overlay District from the separation requirements for restaurants and NR district boundaries; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
- Ms. Tubbs displayed an overhead of the subject district, announcing the Trabue Woods community was in the process of redeveloping their traditional and historic district along Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK), which was proposed to include restaurants. She explained restaurants within the CC zoning district were restricted to areas no closer than 200 feet from NR zoning districts. She advised an exemption from the separation requirements was necessary in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the Trabue Woods historic business district. She recommended approval of ZA-07-10 based upon staff's findings and conclusions.
 - Ms. Anna Callwood, Trabue Woods Economic Development Corporation (EDC) President, observed the overhead depicted the entire Trabue Woods Historic Overlay (TWHO) district; however, she had been under the impression only the MLK area would be affected.
 - Ms. Tubbs responded the area of the TWHO district which was zoned commercial fell within the MLK area. She clarified the overhead outlined the entire TWHO district; however, the underlying CC zoning district was the only area affected.
 - Ms. Callwood expressed hope there would be no limitation to the number of restaurants, adding the EDC would like an opportunity to speak with potential business owners with regard to their intentions.
 - Ms. Tubbs then displayed a current zoning map, pointing out the CC zoning district. She explained without this amendment, a special exception would be required, which in turn would generate notices to the surrounding area; however, with the amendment, a restaurant would be allowed by right. She confirmed a restaurant would not be

permitted within a residential district; however, it could be permitted across the street from same.

- Ms. Callwood explained in the past, the community's leaders were brought in as part of the review process, adding she hoped that would remain the case.
 - Ms. Tubbs advised the special exception application process was the means which prompted same. She stated she was under the impression the community wished to eliminate the special exception requirement.
 - Mayor Goldberg interjected the ordinance was intended to allow restaurants within a 200 foot perimeter of a residential zoning district without being required to pay the \$750 special exception application fee and to undergo the lengthy application process. He opined there were other available processes by which the EDC could remain informed.
 - Discussion then ensued with regard to the specific area affected.
 - Mr. Mitchell Austin, Urban Design Planner, stated the affected parcels numbered 12 along MLK. He explained current Code prohibited restaurants within 200 feet of residentially zoned property. He advised MLK was the heart of the historic, African American commercial district, adding this change was proposed to facilitate the redevelopment of same.
 - Mr. Zapke clarified Dupont and Wood Streets were not impacted. He reiterated the community did not wish to include anything northeast of MLK, asking if the proposed ordinance required an amendment.
 - Mr. Austin replied it did not.
 - Ms. Tubbs called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-07-10.
 - Ms. Matthews MOVED, Mr. Zajicek SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Ms. Matthews MOVED, Mr. Schmidt SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-07-10 based upon the evidence and testimony presented subject to comments made this date. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- F. ZA-08-10 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Chapter 26 City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Code of Ordinances, known as the Land Development Regulations, Article 11, Sign Standards, Amending Section 11.3, Permitted Signs; Amending Subsection 11.3(o), Temporary Pre-development Signs, Clarifying requirements prior to requesting a temporary pre-development sign; Adding a provision for removal of temporary pre-development signs; Repealing Ordinance #1563-08; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.

- Ms. Tubbs announced City Council initiated this action to address the lack of clarity in the existing ordinance as to the placement of a temporary pre-development sign. She explained the proposed amendments would clarify the fact that such signs were subject to the following conditions: sign must include a graphic representation of the project, covering at least 85% of the sign face; proposed development must have conceptual, technical Development Review Committee (DRC) approval; timeline for removal of signs and requirements for obtaining permit submittal and approval; requirement for obtaining a building permit and commencement of construction; requirement for signs to be removed upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.). She noted these provisions were intended to assist developers with pre-sales while protecting the City from the sign clutter and visual blight created by temporary signs which remained on vacant property which was not being developed. She concluded the Urban Design Division recommended approval of ZA-08-10 based upon the above stated findings and conclusions.
- Ms. Matthews stated it appeared there was no longer any sunset clause.
- Ms. Tubbs agreed, stating both the extra extension and sunset clause were deleted as several extensions were provided within the proposed ordinance based upon citizen feedback. She then called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-08-10.
- Mr. Zajicek MOVED, Ms. Matthews SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Burrage MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-08-10 based upon the evidence and testimony presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

STAFF COMMENTS

- A. Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Project Status Report
 - Ms. Tubbs drew members' attention to an update of CRA projects, as delineated in the agenda material, noting same had been requested by members at their previous meeting.
 - Consensus of the Commission was approval of the update's format.
- B. Discussion - Portable "A"-frame Signs
 - Ms. Tubbs recalled City Council adopted an ordinance in August 2009 allowing all businesses the use of a portable "A"-frame sign outside of their business during operating hours; however, the ordinance included a clause wherein same would sunset one year from adoption. She stated since adoption of the ordinance, staff had found several areas required amendment if the City wished to continue to allow this type of sign for all commercial uses. She mentioned numerous types of portable signs currently being used served the purpose of an "A"-frame sign, some being similar in

size and shape but not meeting the literal provisions of City Code. She explained as many businesses in the CC zoning district already had “A”-frame or portable signs, no provision was included in the ordinance which required those signs and businesses to apply for a permit or to come into compliance with the new regulation. She continued the ordinance allowed one sign per building but did not contemplate businesses on a corner or those on one-way streets, adding several businesses had at least two “A”-frame signs prior to adoption of the ordinance. She questioned whether use of these signs should be allowed to continue since the original ordinance had a sunset provision. She recommended the following amendments if use of such signs was allowed to continue: (1) verbiage to better describe the type or types of portable signs permitted, i.e., “A”-frame, portable chalk board, various types of stands to hold the sign, “swinger” or “spring” type signs; (2) should sign size be limiting factor; (3) clarification if a second sign should be permitted for a business located on a corner, especially for businesses on one-way streets; (4) clarify permitted location of sign, i.e., within “X” number of feet of the business entrance; (5) add requirement where any business which currently had portable signs in use must apply for a permit and must make their signs compliant within a specific number of days of adoption of the ordinance; (6) sign maintenance and cleanliness requirements since signs would become dirty and discolored from exposure to outside elements.

- Mr. Burrage clarified only one permit would be required per business, suggesting such permits be provided at no charge.
- Ms. Tubbs stated she was seeking a consensus from members with regard to moving forward as the original ordinance would sunset in August 2010.
- Consensus of the Commission was approval of staff’s proposal with no sunset clause.
- Ms. Tubbs mentioned she planned to disseminate this information to the public prior to moving forward with an actual ordinance.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

- Mayor Goldberg commented he had benefited greatly from attending the various public meetings mentioned earlier, suggesting Commission members may wish to do so as well in the future.
- Mr. Zajicek stated he felt no representatives from the business community had appeared this date because of obligations to their businesses.
- Mayor Goldberg responded he believed the public meetings were held at specific times so as to allow business owners’ attendance. He commented on ZA-06-10, stating that ordinance had been proposed in the spirit of “business friendliness.” He noted he recently met with the PGCC Board of Directors and the DMA to discuss the matter of

the City's business friendliness, adding PGCC Board members expressed their positive feelings regarding same. He advised the CRA invested money directly back into the community for capital projects such as the Herald Court Centre, the City's 400 space, no charge parking garage. He announced the City provided a design studio for potential business owners at no cost as well as expedited permitting and final inspections. He expressed his belief Punta Gorda was very business friendly, stating the City Manager's Weekly Highlights Report (WHR) announced the opening of several businesses each week.

- Mr. Burrage countered it seemed ordinances were being proposed which were more restrictive.
- Mayor Goldberg agreed the LDRs were amended frequently; however, this was done in order to adapt to current business or residential conditions or practices.
- Mr. Schmidt thanked Mayor Goldberg, stating he agreed the City was moving in the right direction with respect to being business friendly. He urged staff and City Council to continue to do so. He concluded he also felt members' attendance at the public meetings mentioned above was an excellent suggestion.

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 4:13 p.m.

Edward Viola, Chairman

Mary Kelly, Recording Secretary