

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING
MARCH 23, 2009**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lynne Matthews, Chairman
Larry Hofmeister, Heinz Schmidt, Jim Stevens,
Edward Viola, Charles Zajicek, Edward Zapke

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Burrage

OTHERS PRESENT: Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official
Tom Jackson, Utilities Director
David Hilston, Urban Design Manager
Dennis Murphy, Growth Management Director
Joan LeBeau, Chief Planner
Stanley Kubik, Alternate Member
Ken Struzik, Clint Keesling, Rick Cavalieri

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting - April 27, 2009
- C. Last Scheduled Meeting - February 23, 2009

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Meeting of February 23, 2009
 - Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Viola SECONDED approval of the February 23, 2009 minutes.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS

- Recording Secretary Kelly swore in all participants.
- A. Public Hearings
 - 1. ZA-03-09 - 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 Subsection 3.13, SRO, Special Residential Overlay District, Amending Subsection 3.13(l), Storage of Vehicles, Providing for allowance for watercraft to be temporarily parked in residential driveways or public right-of-ways (ROWS); providing for temporary parking permits; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
 - Ms. Teri Tubbs, Zoning Official, reminded members of their informal discussion on this subject at a past meeting, stating she had presented the Commission's recommendations and comments to City Council along with those of the Waterfront Development Advisory Committee (WDAC). She explained City Council in turn provided her with direction as to what they wished to see in the proposed ordinance. She drew

members' attention to the draft ordinance, as delineated in the agenda material, providing a detailed review of the proposed changes to current regulations as follows: (1) watercraft may be stored on the dock, a lift, davits or in the water; (2) a provision added to allow small watercraft such as kayaks or canoes to be placed on the roof rack of a vehicle overnight for no more than two consecutive days; (3) allow a single watercraft to be parked in the driveway or ROW, parallel to the road but off of the paved road, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.; (4) watercraft not permitted to be kept or parked on the premises nor within a public ROW between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., unless parked entirely within the confines of a garage or carport or upon obtaining a no charge permit from the City, the latter allowing the watercraft to be parked on the driveway of any premises or in the ROW off of the paved roadway, for up to 2 nights, defined as 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., on no more than 2 occasions per calendar year. She advised the permit would be required to be affixed to the watercraft in a conspicuous place on the street side, adding no encroachment would be allowed upon or to block a public sidewalk or paved roadway. She mentioned the ordinance also outlined the procedure to follow in the event a violation was found in the evening or on a weekend, specifically allowing the Code Compliance Division the opportunity to educate the resident or visitor about the regulations as opposed to issuing a ticket after the first violation. She then listed specific citizen comments which were received after the ordinance was drafted as follows: (1) the subsection title did not reflect same was applicable to watercraft as it was titled "Storage of Vehicles"; (2) suggested changing "may" to "must" and added "or as permitted below" in the sentence which addressed parking in a garage or carport; (3) provision of City Code Section 6-6.4.d omitted, specifically that which required all new boat berths, slips or mooring areas in Burnt Store Isles (BSI) to have a boat lift, davit or similar device designed to keep a boat docked at the slip "out of the water." She pointed out WDAC recommended increasing the number of overnight occasions from two to six per calendar year, adding WDAC also wished to define allowed maintenance as "spark plug changes, flushings, propeller changes and washing/waxing;" however, the draft ordinance was silent with regard to maintenance issues. She asked if there were any comments or concerns, concluding she would pass on the final recommendations of both WDAC and the Commission to City Council.

- Mr. Stevens stated it appeared the ordinance would allow a boat to be parked in a driveway every day from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

- Ms. Tubbs agreed that was the case, stating her understanding from the citizenry was this allowance had not been abused. She mentioned the same allowance existed for recreational vehicles (RVs).
- Mr. Zapke asked if staff was presenting two or six days.
- Ms. Tubbs replied City Council recommended two while WDAC recommended six.
- Mr. Zapke commented on Mr. Stevens' statement with regard to daily parking, asking if a resident would be allowed to work on his or her boat every day provided same was removed by 7:00 p.m.
- Ms. Tubbs replied the work would be limited to minor maintenance.
- Mr. Zapke stated daily parking lessened the need for specifying two and/or six days.
- Mr. Zajicek asked if current water restrictions would limit boat washing.
- Ms. Tubbs expressed uncertainty regarding same; however, she recalled a requirement for hoses to be equipped with a shut-off device.
- Mr. Viola asked if this proposal was requested.
- Ms. Tubbs replied staff was asked to draft an ordinance as the existing Code only allowed maintenance in the rear yard; however, due to the community's build-out, parking in the back yard was almost impossible in the majority of cases.
- Mr. Hofmeister commended Ms. Tubbs on an excellent job of obtaining input from the Commission and City Council. He recommended adding "and watercraft" to the subsection heading. He then asked if boats in PGI must be stored out of the water as was the case in BSI.
- Ms. Tubbs replied boats in PGI were allowed to be kept in the water.
- Mr. Hofmeister then asked if the provisions of the last paragraph would allow commercial vehicles to be parked overnight in residential driveways if such vehicles were used as a means of primary personal transportation.
- Ms. Tubbs replied commercial vehicles were specifically defined in another section of City Code, stating the provision referenced by Mr. Hofmeister referred to such vehicles parked at churches, clinics, schools, public libraries, public buildings, public and club swimming pools, private clubs, golf courses, utilities and park and recreational areas while the person was participating in or attending activities at same.
- Mr. Zajicek mentioned the requirement to store boats out of the water in BSI stemmed from mitigation for removal of the boat lock and applied only to new construction.
- Mr. Viola asked if parking a boat in the driveway was restricted to the homeowner.
- Ms. Tubbs replied it was not restricted in that manner as a home may be rented.
- Ms. Matthews expressed total opposition to the proposed ordinance. She clarified she was not opposed to the section which applied to kayaks.

- Mr. Hofmeister mentioned boats could technically not be parked but rather must be on a trailer, requesting appropriate verbiage be added to prohibit someone from “parking” a boat on jack stands, for example.
 - Ms. Matthews called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-03-09.
 - Mr. Viola MOVED, Mr. Zajicek SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Zajicek asked if PGI, BSI and other homeowner associations were asked to review the proposed ordinance.
 - Ms. Tubbs replied she had sent the draft to all boat clubs and civic associations; however, the response had been minimal.
 - Mr. Viola expressed surprise at the lack of opposition.
 - Mr. Stevens opined this was in conflict with the vast majority of deed restrictions in Burnt Store Meadows (BSM) and BSI.
 - Mr. Zapke commented on the number of residents who worked diligently on their antique automobiles in their driveways, which was not restricted in any way. He stated in one sense the ordinance may be too harsh on boat owners in light of same; however, he felt six times per year was far too many, suggesting two times per year was sufficient.
 - Mr. Hofmeister clarified the existing ordinance allowed two times per year for fifteen days per occurrence in the rear yard.
 - Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Hofmeister SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-03-09 based upon the evidence and testimony presented allowing two permits per calendar year and to change the title to “Storage of Vehicles and Watercraft.”
 - VOTING AYE: Hofmeister, Schmidt, Zajicek, Zapke.
 - VOTING NAY: Stevens, Viola, Matthews.
 - MOTION CARRIED.
2. ZA-04-09 - 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 Subsection 3.13, Special Residential Overlay District, Subsection (o), Water Wells, Providing for permitting requirements for wells installed for irrigation purposes; providing for buffering requirements; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
- Ms. Tubbs stated water wells were not permitted in the Special Residential Overlay (SRO) zoning districts; however, irrigation was required. She explained the Utilities Department had initiated this zoning amendment in an effort to limit the use of potable water for irrigation, listing the proposed changes as follows: drilling of water

wells allowed only with proper permits; all installed wells must utilize a submersible pump in order to limit the amount of above ground piping and equipment; all above grade pipe or equipment must be fully landscaped so as not to be visible from streets or adjoining properties; any pump locations to abide by requirements of the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and the Charlotte County Health Department, with final approval by the City; no well would be permitted to be located closer than 20 feet from the center of a seawall cap. She concluded this proposed change would reduce the amount of potable water being used for irrigation purposes; thus, the Utilities Department and Urban Design Division recommended approval of ZA-04-09.

- Mr. Zapke asked if any studies had been conducted which showed the withdrawal of water from the sub-aquifer would deplete fresh water resources.
- Mr. Tom Jackson, Utilities Director, replied a number of studies had been done which looked at the relationship between draw-down and aquifer recovery. He stated the City was located in the southern tip of the Southern Water Use Caution Area (SWUCA) which was tasked by SWFWMD with protection of drinking water deeper in the Florida Aquifer; however, the aquifer contemplated in the subject ordinance change was well above same and tended to recharge very rapidly. He confirmed this proposal had no direct connection to drinking water.
- Mr. Zajicek asked if any depth limitation was recommended.
- Mr. Jackson replied affirmatively, stating same was set by the Health Department through SWFWMD's guidance.
- Mr. Stevens clarified a permit would be required through one of those agencies, dependent upon the size of well.
- Ms. Matthews asked if the proposed ordinance applied to any residential property in Punta Gorda.
- Ms. Tubbs replied it applied to the SRO.
- Mr. Hofmeister expressed frustration at "being held hostage" by SWFWMD. He pointed out water rates had been increased following imposition of SWFWMD's water restrictions to ensure adequate revenues, adding irrigation wells would again result in less water being pumped from the City's plant. He opined most irrigation wells would have to be located in front yards as drilling equipment would not be able to be brought into rear yards.
- Mr. Stevens clarified irrigation from private wells must still adhere to SWFWMD's watering restrictions.

- Mr. Ken Struzik, PGI Section 14 Property Owner's Association President, displayed an overhead depicting the location of Section 14 between Aqui Esta Drive, Guadalupe Drive, Magdalena Drive and Conecta Drive. He stated a recent City utility bill, issued after repair was made to the Section 14 greenbelt's irrigation system, was just under \$400, thus making watering prohibitive for co-owners of that section of property. He explained remnants of a well existed on the property, advising same could be reconnected which in turn would allow the greenbelt to be maintained. He assured the Association's adherence to any and all watering restrictions.
 - Mr. Zajicek questioned ownership of this property.
 - Mr. Struzik replied property owners of each of the 69 homes were required to be a member of the association and pay annual fees accordingly.
 - Mr. Hofmeister commented on the one day per week watering restrictions, stating same was insufficient to sustain Bermuda grass and, in fact, would further impact utility revenues.
 - Ms. Matthews called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-04-09.
 - Mr. Viola MOVED, Mr. Hofmeister SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Zapke acknowledged Mr. Struzik's comments and desires, stating he also was sympathetic to the concerns expressed by Mr. Hofmeister. He asked if there had been a significant number of requests for wells.
 - Mr. Jackson replied there had been a few. He explained SWFWMD's rationale was wells were not intended to be used for potable water but rather a lesser quality to be used only on lawns, plants, etc. He clarified more potable water would thus be available for the public's use.
 - Ms. Matthews suggested Mr. Struzik's request would be more appropriately handled under the variance application process.
 - Mr. Stevens MOVED, Mr. Schmidt SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-04-09 based upon the evidence and testimony presented.
 - VOTING AYE: Schmidt, Stevens, Viola.
 - VOTING NAY: Hofmeister, Zajicek, Zapke, Matthews.
 - MOTION FAILED.
3. ZA-05-09 - 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 10, Parking and Loading, Amending Subsection 10.3(f) and (h), Parking Specifications; Providing for parking space standards; providing for maximum driveway widths; providing for required driveway materials; providing for minimum distance from

intersecting right-of-way lines; providing for maximum number of ingress and egress points per property; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.

- Ms. Tubbs stated current Land Development Regulations (LDRs) did not address the number and location of driveways nor the type and size of parking spaces which may be needed for all types of development. She explained the proposed amendment clarified the size of a standard parking space, included provisions to allow for a percentage of parking spaces to be designated for compact vehicles and motorcycles/scooters and the provision requiring handicap spaces per State and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. She noted the amendment clarified permitting for all driveways, required driveway materials, required distances from intersections to include provisions allowing the reviewing department to take each site into consideration to ensure the public's safety, driveway separation at locations with more than one driveway on a single site, setbacks from property lines and handicap accessibility regulations. She summarized the proposed amendments clarified driveway requirements and created a certain flexibility to adjust driveway locations as needed to ensure all public safety issues could be addressed. She recommended approval of ZA-05-09, offering to answer any questions regarding same.
- Mr. Zajicek commented on Section 10.3(h)15), asking if sidewalks would be required to be ADA accessible when crossing a private driveway.
- Ms. Tubbs replied affirmatively.
- Mr. David Hilston, Urban Design Manager, explained sidewalks constructed in a public right-of-way (ROW) must always accommodate handicapped persons.
- Mr. Zajicek then noted Section 10.3(h)6) required residential driveways to be no more than 16 feet in width, asking how three car driveways/garages would be accommodated.
- Ms. Tubbs replied the 16 foot restriction applied to the section of driveway located in the ROW; however, driveways could be wider beyond that point. She explained the reason behind this requirement was related to storm water run-off causing a great deal of sheet flow.
- Mr. Hofmeister clarified this applied to single family residential, asking why the ordinance also addressed parking spaces.
- Ms. Tubbs explained it also applied to multi-family and commercial development. She explained single family use was omitted from the original draft.
- Mr. Hofmeister noted Finding #2 addressed required parking spaces, stating a provision was included which allowed for a percentage of parking spaces to be for

compact and motorcycle parking. He opined this provided a loophole for commercial developers who may not wish to assume the cost for additional parking.

- Mr. Zajicek reiterated his concerns regarding a three car garage/driveway, asking how same would accommodate the ROW requirement.
 - Ms. Tubbs explained the distance between the property line and house setback was a minimum of 25 feet, which provided space for the driveway to flare out, which had been done in numerous locations since 2005.
 - Mr. Hilston displayed an overhead depicting how a three car driveway could be accommodated.
 - Ms. Matthews questioned the width of a standard, single lane driveway.
 - Ms. Tubbs replied as narrow as eight feet.
 - Mr. Hofmeister interjected this ordinance was being proposed because of sheet flow, asking if a culvert would address same.
 - Ms. Tubbs replied it would not.
 - Mr. Hofmeister commented he did not see how restricting driveway width would affect sheet flow.
 - Mr. Dennis Murphy, Growth Management Director, responded the Public Works Department/Engineering Division had made this recommendation. He explained reducing the driveway width at the ROW decreased the amount of impervious surface.
 - Ms. Matthews called three times for anyone to speak on ZA-05-09.
 - Mr. Stevens MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Zapke MOVED, Mr. Zajicek SECONDED to recommend approval of ZA-05-09 based upon the evidence and testimony presented contingent upon motorcycle parking being provided in no more than two contiguous spaces. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
4. SE-04-09 - A Special Exception request by Klint and Rachael Keesling, per Section 26-16.8 of the City Code of Ordinances, to allow artificial turf to be installed on private property as permitted by Special Exception approval per City Code Section 26-12.3(n), at 850 Bimini Lane in a General Single Family (GS) zoning district.
- Legal Description: Block 98, Lot 34, Punta Gorda Isles, Section 11 Replat
- Ms. Tubbs displayed an overhead of the site location and attested to staff's Findings 1 through 4, as delineated in the agenda material, stating the applicant had shown the proposed turf met or exceeded all required criteria per Ordinance #1579-09. She mentioned the artificial turf was in place at this time as the applicant had understood City Code would be amended much sooner than had been the case.
 - Mr. Viola confirmed the applicant had installed the artificial turf without a permit.

- Ms. Matthews mentioned the artificial turf in the subject location was quite different from nearby sod.
- Mr. Hofmeister asked if sod had been installed in the front swale.
- Ms. Tubbs replied affirmatively, stating the majority of the front yard was covered in sod. She displayed photographs of the living plant material in the applicant's yard along with the artificial turf.
- Ms. Matthews asked if the applicant intended to install artificial turf throughout the property.
- Ms. Tubbs replied a request for same had not been submitted.
- Ms. Matthews disclosed she had seen the subject grounds, stating the artificial turf looked terrible laying next to the sod as it was two completely different colors. She noted she had originally recommended artificial turf be required throughout a yard as opposed to only parts of same, adding the photographs were evidence of the reason for same.
- Mr. Viola expressed surprise this amount of work was done without a permit.
- In response to Ms. Matthews' concern, Ms. Tubbs replied the ordinance required artificial turf to be "broken" in some manner, stating the applicant had used curbing in some instances and landscaping in others. She provided members with a sample of artificial turf, stating the turf was not attached in any way to the seawall. She noted if maintenance was required in the City ROW or to the seawall, seawall cap or any utility easement, the property owner would be responsible to remove, replace and/or repair, at his/her expense, any artificial turf within 60 days of such work and/or maintenance. She confirmed the City would not be held liable for damage to any artificial turf or other items placed within the ROW, within six feet of the seawall or within any area covering any City utilities. She advised a copy of the approved special exception and conditions thereof must be recorded in the Public Records of Charlotte County in order to notice any subsequent purchasers of the special rules relating to the artificial turf. She concluded with a recommendation for approval from the Urban Design Division and the Development Review Committee (DRC).
- Mr. Zapke asked if the boundary between the two properties were delineated by curbing from the seawall to the roadway.
- Ms. Tubbs replied the curbing did not extend the full distance to the street.
- Mr. Zapke asked if any complaints had been submitted by neighbors of the applicant.
- Ms. Tubbs replied she had not received any complaints but rather had received letters of support.

- Mr. Klint Keesling, applicant, announced his full intention to install artificial turf from the ROW to the street, acknowledging the need for a ROW permit.
 - Ms. Matthews called three times for anyone to speak on SE-04-09.
 - Mr. Zajicek MOVED, Mr. Hofmeister SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 - Mr. Hofmeister MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to recommend approval of SE-04-09 based upon the evidence and testimony presented provided the applicant installed artificial turf throughout 100% of the property, including the ROW, other than landscaped areas. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
5. PD-01-09 - An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Ordinance #1498-07, Rezoning property described on Exhibit A, Parcel #412307477007, containing 13.39 acres, more or less, and commonly known as 24500 Airport Road; from Neighborhood Center (NC) to Planned Development Neighborhood/Neighborhood Center (PDN/NC) for the development of a senior housing rental neighborhood to provide up to 176 units of public housing and tax credit housing for seniors and related amenities; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date; and
- An Ordinance of the City of Punta Gorda, Florida, Amending Ordinance #1496-07, for property described on Exhibit A, Parcel #412307477007, containing 13.39 acres, more or less, and commonly known as 24500 Airport Road; Removing Exhibit "B" to allow up to 176 units of public housing and tax credit housing for seniors with related amenities; providing for conflict and severability; and providing an effective date.
- Ms. Joan LeBeau, Chief Planner, displayed an overhead of the site location, as delineated in the agenda material, stating the Punta Gorda Housing Authority (PGHA) had proposed the subject zoning amendment. She attested to staff's Findings 1 through 5, as denoted in the Commission's agenda packets, adding staff considered the application to be in order. She explained the intent of the original ordinance was to provide housing opportunities to eligible purchasers and to maintain this affordability to a moderate income for a specific amount of years. She clarified the PGHA's purpose of this property would provide rental housing opportunities to senior residents of the City, thereby ensuring affordability of the property in perpetuity. She noted the property was planned to be divided as depicted in the site plan so as to allow the affordable senior housing to be developed on the easterly side of the property (previously Lot 16). She stated the remaining easterly portion of Lot 15 would retain the NC zoning designation and may be developed in a manner which met the LDRs. She recommended approval of the request, offering to address members' concerns.

- Mr. Zapke stated he understood projects of this sort typically were reviewed by DRC prior to the Commission.
- Ms. LeBeau explained the future development of the westerly portion of the property would come before DRC at a later date.
- Ms. Matthews asked why it was felt senior housing was more advantageous on this property than the workforce housing originally proposed.
- Ms. LeBeau replied sufficient workforce housing existed in light of the current economy; thus, the need was being met. She explained the need for senior housing increased following the loss of the PGHA's East Marion Avenue property in August 2004 as a result of Hurricane Charley.
- Ms. Matthews commented it seemed work force housing was needed as much as senior housing.
- Ms. LeBeau reiterated the need for work force housing was minimal at this time.
- Mr. Stevens confirmed the proposal was for three story buildings.
- Mr. Rick Cavalieri, North Star Development, added this would be interior corridor, primarily one bedroom units. He opined the first phase would be 60 units, of which 56 would be 1 bedroom and the balance 2 bedrooms.
- Mr. Stevens questioned the maximum building height.
- Mr. Cavalieri estimated 40 to 50 feet.
- Ms. Tubbs interjected the units would be limited to the same as standard, multi-family building height, which was 40 feet from base flood elevation (BFE) to the top of the tie beam.
- Ms. Matthews called three times for anyone to speak on PD-01-09.
- Mr. Viola MOVED, Mr. Zapke SECONDED to close the public hearing. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- Mr. Zajicek MOVED, Mr. Schmidt SECONDED to recommend approval of PD-01-09 based upon the evidence and testimony presented. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Discussion – Solar Panels in the Required Yard
- Ms. Tubbs stated City Code currently allowed solar installations to encroach four feet in side and rear yards, adding a property owner could have solar panels installed on their roof. She announced staff had been asked about the use of photovoltaic solar panels or solar water heaters, the most recent request being a heater made of approximately 18 tubes connected together measuring 36 square feet in area; however, the contractor had advised the roof in this particular instance would not allow for installation due to the direction in which the roof surface faced. She continued the

contractor had sought allowance to place the structure in the rear yard; however, due to existing setbacks, the structure would encroach into the required yard. She stated staff anticipated other requests of this sort to continue due to the current trend toward sustainable buildings, energy efficiency and alternate energy sources. She drew members' attention to a copy of Florida Statute (F.S.) 163.04, as delineated in the agenda material, as well as other information regarding renewable energy sources and incentive programs. She requested members' comments and recommendations, further asking if amendments to City Code would be appropriate to encourage energy efficient new construction as well as provisions for retrofitting existing structures.

- Ms. Matthews spoke in favor of leaving the current rules in place.
 - Consensus of the Commission was to recommend no change.
- B. Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Status Report
- Ms. Matthews asked if an update was available on the Hilton Gardens project.
 - Mr. Hilston replied an agreement was in place with the Sheraton allowing parking on the parcel.
- C. Parks & Recreation Master Plan Charrette Update
- Ms. LeBeau commented favorably on the recent public workshop, stating a great deal of information was obtained. She noted staff would move forward and present their initial results to the Commission in May or June 2009.

MEMBER COMMENTS

- Mr. Schmidt expressed agreement with the Commission's action with regard to solar panels; however, he opined this issue would become more critical as time went on.
- Ms. Tubbs displayed an overhead depicting a draft rendering of the proposed Welcome/Entranceway sign.
- Mr. Murphy noted the latest rendering included the City seal and the "City of Punta Gorda" as opposed to "Hibiscus City."
- Mr. Hofmeister asked if the sign lettering could be floated on plastic or glass to provide clearer visibility.
- Mr. Hilston noted the layout was constantly changing.
- Mr. Hofmeister then agreed solar energy sources must be tapped; however, he spoke in opposition to placing panels in the yard.

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 3:31 p.m.

Lynne Matthews, Chairman

Mary Kelly, Recording Secretary